H. F. HAFER

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/gettingacquainte0000fran

GETTING ACQUAINTED WITH THE NEW TESTAMENT

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO · DALLAS
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

GETTING ACQUAINTED
WITH THE
NEW TESTAMENT

BY

FRANK EAKIN, PH.D.

PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY (FORMERLY ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR IN THE NEW TESTAMENT DEPARTMENT) IN WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, PITTSBURGH, PA.

THE CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY LIBRARY

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1927

All rights reserved

225.061
E11g

Copyright, 1927,
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and printed.
Published April, 1927.

R5069

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE CORNWALL PRESS

To

My Father and Mother

PREFACE

This book is intended as an introduction to the New Testament for students and general readers. Its main excuse for existence is in the fact that there has been hitherto a regrettable gap between the standard technical introductions on the one hand and the large array of popular works on the other hand. The technical introductions have been and are of the greatest service to scholars and advanced students. This applies notably to Jülicher's *Introduction to the New Testament* and Moffatt's *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament.* But from their nature they are not well adapted to give to the general student or educated reader the orientation which he wants and needs. Among the popular books there are some—such as Moffatt's *Approach to the New Testament* and E. F. Scott's *The New Testament To-day*—which are admirable as far as they go, but they do not aim at a comprehensive introduction. Of some others it may be said, without unfairness, that they are either too scholarly to be popular or too popular to be scholarly.

Jülicher defends his *Introduction* against the criticism, made after the first edition had appeared, that it was not "theological" enough—lacked "an edifying tone." The answer of course was that a display of theological interest or the use of an edifying tone, in such a work, was out of place—that it afforded just ground for suspicion as to the scientific character of the study embodied in the book. The same may be said of a book like the present one, but with a difference. Undoubtedly a fair proportion of the

readers of this book—if it finds readers—will be men and women who are engaged in some capacity or other in the great enterprise of religious education. And in this enterprise the New Testament is rightly used as a means to an end, the end being—in the best sense of the word—to *edify*. Now I have not conceived my task to be to present to such readers ready-made edification from the New Testament, yet I have tried not to forget their point of view and interest. I have deliberately omitted—or devoted only small space to—certain subjects which have an important place in the general field of knowledge concerning the New Testament, but which do not seem to me to have great value for the practical understanding and use of this classical Christian literature in our day: for example, text criticism and the history of the ancient versions. And, on the more positive side, I have not hesitated to "moralize" here and there beyond what would have been expected or would have been proper in a work having only a scientific aim.

In short, I have tried to do justice at one and the same time to both the scientific and the practical demands. Perhaps I have not succeeded well. Perhaps it cannot be done. But it has seemed to me worth while to make the effort.

The plan of the work will be fairly obvious from the table of contents. Any one of the four parts may be read or studied separately, but I think that the order in which they are here arranged will commend itself as useful. The first part is intended as introductory, having to do with methods of study: past and present, technical and non-technical. The second part, "The History of the New Testament," traces the emergence of these writings in answer to situations and needs in the early church, their gathering together into groups and ultimately into one group, their acquiring the character of a Scripture, and the story of how this Scripture has come down to us

in the several English versions which we know. The third part, more immediately preparatory to a study of the contents of the writings themselves, has to do with their background: historical and political, Jewish and Hellenistic, cultural and religious. Finally, in the fourth part, we come to "The Matter of the New Testament," considered from the point of view of literature, of history, and of religion.

Acknowledgment is due, first and foremost, to Professor C. W. Votaw, Ph.D., of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, who read the book in manuscript, and to whom I am indebted for much scholarly advice and kindly counsel. To others of my one-time teachers in the field of New Testament studies—in Western Theological Seminary of Pittsburgh, the University of Chicago, Glasgow University, and the University of Marburg —I am under obligation which is more general but very real. The same is to be said of my debt to my colleagues at Western Seminary and to the men whose presence in my classroom during the past twelve years has been a constant source of help and inspiration. My indebtedness to the authors of numerous books on New Testament subjects will be evident throughout the following chapters.

Grateful acknowledgment is made to the authors and publishers named below for permission to quote from their respective works:

Houghton, Mifflin Co.: *The Riverside New Testament* by W. G. Ballantine; *Paul and Paulinism* by James Moffatt; Harcourt, Brace & Co.: *Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus from the Psychological and Psycho-Analytic Point of View* by G. Berguer; E. P. Dutton & Co.: *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire* by L. Friedländer; *New Testament History* by G. W. Wade; The Oxford Press: *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* by R. H. Charles; The Cambridge University Press: *An Intro-*

duction to the Old Testament in Greek by H. B. Swete; Geo. H. Doran Co.: *Light from the Ancient East* by A. Deissman; *The New Testament, A New Translation* by James Moffatt; Association Press: *The Jesus of History* by T. U. Glover; University of Chicago Press: *The New Testament, An American Translation* by E. J. Goodspeed; G. P. Putnam's Sons: *Luke the Physician* by A. Harnack; *An Introduction to the New Testament* by A. Jülicher; Chas. Scribner's Sons: *The Life and Teachings of Jesus* by C. F. Kent, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* by James Moffatt; *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ* by E. Schürer; *The Fourth Gospel, Its Purpose and Theology* by E. F. Scott; Thos. Nelson & Sons: A. S. Peake, *Commentary on the Bible;* American Baptist Publishing Society: *Centenary Translation of The New Testament,* by Mrs. Helen M. Montgomery; Columbia University Press: *Four Stages of Greek Religion* by Gilbert Murray; Henry Holt & Co.: *Euripedes and His Age* by Gilbert Murray.

Acknowledgment is also due the editor and publishers of the *Journal of Religion* for permission to use material from an article by the present author on "New Translations of the New Testament."

F. E.

Western Theological Seminary,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

CONTENTS

PART I

THE STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Use of the New Testament in the Past	3
II.	Modern Study of the New Testament—The Scholar's Method	14
III.	Modern Study of the New Testament—Methods for Non-technical Study . .	26

PART II

THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

IV.	A Missionary's Letters—The Beginning of Christian Literature	41
V.	Narratives of Christian Origins	58
VI.	Further Writings in Response to Further Needs	75
VII.	How Miscellaneous Christian Writings Came to Be a "New Testament" . . .	96
VIII.	How the English New Testament Came to Be	110
IX.	The King James and the Revised Versions .	128
X.	Modern Unofficial Translations . . .	148

PART III

THE BACKGROUND OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

XI.	The Historical and Political Background .	169
XII.	The Jewish Background: Cultural . . .	185
XIII.	The Jewish Background: Religious . . .	204
XIV.	The Hellenistic Background: Cultural .	228
XV.	The Hellenistic Background; Religious .	252

PART IV
THE MATTER OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER		PAGE
XVI.	New Testament Literature: Characteristic Features	281
XVII.	New Testament Literature: Literary Types	302
XVIII.	New Testament History: Jesus—Birth and Early Life	327
XIX.	New Testament History: Jesus—Public Life and Death	348
XX.	New Testament History: The Rise and Spread of the Christian Church	374
XXI.	New Testament History: The Life and Work of Paul	395
XXII.	New Testament History: The Life and Work of Paul (*Continued*)	418
XXIII.	New Testament History: After Paul	441
XXIV.	New Testament Religion: A Summary	465
	Suggestions for Further Reading	479
	Index	483

PART I

THE STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

GETTING ACQUAINTED WITH THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER I

THE USE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IN THE PAST

A. Introductory.

Our effort, in going through this book, will be to understand the New Testament better than we have understood it before. It is well that, at the beginning, we should give some thought to methods of studying and using the New Testament. And we shall do well, first of all, to notice how the New Testament has been studied and used in the past.

As serious students of the Bible we are following in the line of some of the greatest men of world history. The names of Origen and Augustine, of Luther, Calvin, and Wesley, are great names. These men influenced not only their own times but all time, and it was largely through their study of the Bible, and the products of that study, that their influence went forth. These and others scarcely less great—the intellectual and spiritual giants of past Christian centuries—have served as models in Bible study down to our own time. The danger is that we follow them too thoughtlessly and carelessly. One of the chief things that marked them as great was the fact that they did not continue slavishly to do and think as those who had gone before them had done and thought. They made use of the best thought and knowledge of their day, and of the powers of mind and spirit which God had given to them. And we may be sure that if they could advise us they would bid us follow them in this—follow

them by going beyond them, whither God and truth may lead. It is easy, in the light of the fuller knowledge and insight which time has brought us, to see and point out their mistakes. We have much to learn from these, as well as from that in their work which seems to us good and permanent.

B. Mistakes in its Use.

(a) *Fanciful Use.* In the fanciful, or allegorical, use of Biblical matter Origen (c. 182-251 A. D.) may be said to have set the pace. It is true that his ideas and methods were largely taken over from his teacher, Clement of Alexandria, but it was through Origen's commentaries and other writings that those ideas and methods became popularized—became practically standard, indeed, for centuries.

The following, from Origen's comments on John 1:27 and parallel passages in the other Gospels, will serve as an example. (The passages have to do with John the Baptist's statement about not being worthy to unloose the latchet of Jesus' shoe. The wording differs somewhat in the different Gospels, and Origen finds each separate expression to have a special significance.)

> If the passage about the shoes has a mystic meaning we ought not to scorn to consider it. Now I consider that the inhumanization when the Son of God assumes flesh and blood is one of his shoes, and that the other is the descent to Hades, whatever that Hades be, and the journey with the Spirit to the prison. . . . He, then, who is able worthily to set forth the meaning of these two journeys is able to untie the latchet of the shoes of Jesus; he, bending down in his mind and going with Jesus as He goes down into Hades, and descending from heaven and the mysteries of Christ's deity to the advent He of

> necessity made with us when He took on man (as His shoes). . . . Who, then, is able to stoop down and untie the latchet of such shoes, and having untied them not to let them drop, but by the second faculty he has received to take them up and bear them, by bearing the meaning of them in his memory?

This is only a small part of the argument, but it will suffice to show how it runs. A briefer comment on Matt. 15:21 will further illustrate this method of handling Scripture. The verse reads: "And Jesus went out thence and withdrew into the parts of Tyre and Sidon." Says Origen: "When Jesus, then, went out from Gennesaret He withdrew indeed from Israel, and came, not to Tyre and Sidon, but into the parts of Tyre and Sidon, with the result that those of the Gentiles now believe in part; so that if He had visited the whole of Tyre and Sidon, no unbeliever would have been left in it."

Augustine (354-430 A. D.) wrestles with what is said about the Samaritan woman's husband, in the 4th chapter of John, in much the same way as Origen had exercised himself over the matter of the shoes. He finds that when Jesus bade the woman, "Go call thy husband," what he really meant was that she should summon her *understanding* so as to grasp what he had to say to her. The key to this interpretation is simple. In a well-ordered life the understanding rules, and in a well-ordered family the husband rules, hence to Augustine it was natural and fitting that Jesus should speak of a husband when the understanding was what he really had in mind. The "five husbands," who are met with a little farther on in the chapter, are the five senses, though the view that they represent the five books of Moses is referred to with respect.

The greater part of the matter in these ancient commentaries, we must understand, is more sensible than

this. Yet what has been quoted is by no means unique. And it will suffice to show that these learned Christians of the past studied their Bibles in a way which modern Christian leaders can neither practice nor approve. Fancy in the use of Scripture certainly is not unknown to-day, but it is discredi[illegible] Men in any way comparable to Origen and Augustine in ability and rank would not think of using it as they did. Calvin (1509-1564) wrought mightily in bringing about the change. Since his time it has been seen with increasing clearness that to get the plain meaning of a passage, as the writer meant it, is the thing of first importance. The trouble with fancy is that it has no bounds. Unless the plain meaning is grasped and kept in view the Bible can easily be made to teach whatever the user wants it to teach.

(b) *Dogmatic Use.* What is meant by this is the use of Scripture to support doctrines or ideas which one believes to be right—without being careful enough to make sure that the meaning thus taken from the Scripture passage is what the writer intended it to mean. Augustine has this comment on Ps. 19:1 ("The heavens declare the glory of God"): "The righteous Evangelists, in whom, as in the heavens, God dwelleth, set forth the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ, or the glory wherewith the Son glorified the Father upon earth." Augustine seems to have seriously believed that the writer of this psalm, in writing, "The heavens declare the glory of God," referred to the Gospel writers declaring the glory of Christ—a predictive reference, of course. Elsewhere in Augustine's writings we learn that he had two fundamental rules as to how the Bible should and should not be used. According to one rule no meaning for a passage was to be accepted which did not "tend to establish the reign of love." According to the other rule no meaning could be right which did not agree with the accepted doctrines of the church. Now one may hold that both

the "reign of love" and the doctrines of the church are great and excellent things, and yet be convinced that Augustine's rules for the use of Scripture were bad rules. They were bad because they decided in advance what, in substance, this or that Scripture passage must say.

Calvin, great commentator though he was, is not a good model here. When he was still in his twenties he worked out a system of theology which he believed to be in accordance with Scripture and with truth. It was a great system, and large bodies of Christians still hold to it. Later Calvin wrote his commentaries—and naturally we find them presenting the teaching of the different parts of Scripture as a uniform system of truth, the system already worked out in the "Institutes." Even though we think that the result, in Calvin's case, was good, we should realize that the method cannot be upheld as ideal. The fact is that it dishonors the Bible—shows lack of trust in it—to approach it with the fixed idea that all parts have essentially the same teaching and with settled convictions as to what that teaching is. The true ideal is to let the Bible writers say what they wished to say, taking from the several books such system, or lack of system, as free and unhampered study may reveal.

The dogmatic use of Scripture, for better or worse, has had its day. The problem of making sure that the Bible will be used only in ways that are sane and profitable is not solved. We may sigh for infallible guidance, in this as in other matters, but we sigh in vain. The church, through most of its history, has tried to supply such guidance. Its popes, bishops, councils, or creeds have put forth pronouncements as to how the Bible should be used: it was for the people to use it thus and not otherwise. But the effort has never been more than moderately successful, and to-day, except with backward populations, it has utterly lost its force. We are committed

to the principle of freedom, and we must make the best of it. It may never bring us release from error, but it does encourage an eager, joyous search for the truth.

(c) *Polemical Use.* No reputable scholar, in our time, would think of making a commentary on the Bible serve as a weapon against his enemies. Calvin did it, and his blasts against the Papists, the Anabaptists, or other errorists strike the modern reader as a jarring note. But it is idle to blame Calvin: it was the custom of the time —and of much more recent times. In the denominational bickerings, which have so recently passed into history, each side was wont to fortify its position, and assault the opposing position, with Scripture passages. Our grandfathers' use of Scripture was too largely of this sort. It was neither sound in method nor Christian in spirit, and we have every reason to be thankful that it has passed.

(d) *Undiscriminating Use.* That is, taking all Biblical (or New Testament) matter as on the same level, of equal value, and applying to all time. This lack of discrimination has wrought much harm. In past centuries it has been generally believed that the New Testament practice in such matters as the form of baptism and the appointment of church officers was a vital part of the Christian gospel. Often more stress seems to have been placed upon these matters than upon Jesus' teaching about love for God and fellowman. The results were very unfortunate. New Testament practice and teaching on these incidental points is not always the same, as we now clearly see. In some cases there is room for difference of opinion as to just what was done, or enjoined. One group of our forefathers understood in one, another in another, way, and so the Christian brotherhood was divided into hostile camps. Happily the great bodies of Christendom no longer quarrel over these things, but the fact that there are such bodies—that the Christian enterprise is weakened by divisions which represent no pres-

ent convictions or realities—this fact should serve as a warning against allowing an undiscriminating use of the source books of our religion to stand in the way of the religion itself.

Almost every great reform movement in the history of Christian nations has found an undiscriminating use of Scripture among the forces with which it had to contend. During the long abolition controversy in America powerful use was made of the argument that slavery was of divine institution, as clearly set forth in the Bible. More recently the movements against intoxicants, and for the enfranchisement of women, have had the same battle to fight. The fact is that while human slavery, the traffic in intoxicants, and the subordination of women are all in very definite conflict with the gospel of Jesus, every one of them may be supported from the Bible—so long as the Bible is used in an undiscriminating way. Progress in reform is gradual. God leads his people slowly, as it seems to us, in the upward way. Great strides were made in the period covered by the Biblical books, but not until long afterward were even the most enlightened races ready for such movements as those which our times have witnessed. It is rather in the spirit with which they attacked their problems than in detailed directions for attacking ours that the Biblical writers and characters show us the way. Christianity is not bibliolatry. It is a person, not a book, whom we call our Leader, Master, Lord. The book shows him to us; but having seen him, grasped his point of view, learned what it is that he would say to us and do for us, we must judge the voice of the Book, as well as other voices, by their harmony with his voice.

(e) *Detached Use.* This mistaken use is closely related to the preceding one. It is last on our list, and probably it, more than any of the others, belongs to the present as well as the past. Fortunately, the results of this error

are not always harmful. "Search the Scriptures" is good advice, regardless of the fact that it can find a place in the Bible only through a detaching of certain words from their context in a way that is unwarranted. "Ye search the scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me; and ye will not come to me, that ye may have life" (John 5:39-40; R. V.). This gives the true sense of the passage. The familiar words are meant as a statement about "the Jews," not as a command. "Lay hands hastily on no man" (1 Tim. 5:22) is usually supposed, when detached from its context, to be a caution against violence. Such certainly is not the real meaning, though probably no harm has been done by the mistake. (It probably refers to the ordination of church officers. See Moffatt's translation.)

But the detached use of Scripture has by no means always been of this harmless character. Almost anything can be "proved"—and almost everything has been proved —by taking smaller or larger fragments of Biblical matter out of their contexts and using them as seems good to the user, regardless of what the writer had in mind. Mrs. Eddy's *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures* is a shining example of the way in which the peculiar views of a sect or "ism" may be based on the Bible—entirely apart from any understanding or appreciation of the thoughts which the different writers meant to convey.

This error, indeed, is but part of a larger error—that of thinking of the Bible as a sort of book of magic, the values of which are appropriated directly, almost mechanically. From this point of view the very real situations which called forth the different "books" of the Bible are of little moment, the very human personalities who live and move on its pages become conventional and colorless. Preaching is a form, a part of the weekly ritual.

So largely does this view prevail, even in this enlightened age, that the average church attendant does not think of requiring of his minister that he should draw forth from his Bible large, constructive thoughts, dealing with issues that are real and vital, and that he should compel his hearer to grapple with them. The great constructive thoughts and ideals are there, but Bible users have all too little accustomed themselves to finding and appropriating them.

C. Value in its Use in Spite of Mistakes.

(a) The use of the New Testament in the past, notwithstanding mistaken ideas and methods, has kept the life and the ideals of Jesus from being forgotten—in a world largely hostile to them.

We dare not assume that the church would have done this without the New Testament. The sad fact is that the church's own understanding of Jesus, and loyalty to his ideals, have left much to be desired. Progress has been made through the centuries. We may say, without undue presumption, that we understand Jesus better than he was understood some centuries ago, and that his ideals are actually, though slowly, winning their way. But he is still far ahead of us. And it is very fortunate that as we try to follow his leadership in the transforming of our lives and of our world we are able to turn back, constantly, to those primitive writings which bring us so near to him, which reflect his influence upon his earliest followers.

(b) It has kept the church reminded of its beginnings —of the earnestness and the joy with which its earliest members applied Christianity to their lives and thought and work.

To St. Paul—to cite a single New Testament writer and character—Christianity was first of all a life. It was a life with God in Christ—a life of wondrous privilege

and of joy unspeakable. But there was also, to him, another side, more formal and intellectual. Christianity was also a system of truth. It was not only a religion but a theology. This was inevitable, as were other things that followed. Since Christianity was a system of truth it had to be expounded and defended as over against other systems of truth, or what was alleged to be truth. There had to be wars, with pen and later with sword, against schism and heresy. To aid in this warfare and meet the needs of the growing church in general, the simple organization of earlier days had to give place to one much more elaborate. By and by the imperial government itself, under Constantine, became the patron of Christianity, which meant that the primitive simplicity was still further replaced by the symbols of pomp and power. There were reactions later, to be sure—notably in Luther's time. Yet almost from the beginning it has been hard for Christianity to maintain itself as a religion of the spirit. The formal side has ever pushed itself forward, threatening to become the whole.

And here again—in combating this danger—the possession of the New Testament has been a very great boon. We can scarcely doubt that but for it the lapse into formalism would have been more serious and irrevocable; for Paul's view of our religion as essentially a thing of the inner life to have held its ground would have been more difficult. It is significant that the reformers—Wyclif, Luther, Wesley, and the rest—have invariably pictured, as over against the formalism and evil practices of their day, the simple faith and joyous zeal which are seen in the religion of the New Testament. The New Testament itself is not without its formal, theological, ecclesiastical elements, yet its dominant note is none of these. What looms largest as one reads its pages is the reality of God and of the life of the spirit, with Christ as their mediator and interpreter. It is well that back of

its organization and its ritual, back of its creeds and its theologies, the church has had, and has, its New Testament.

(c) It has provided a wealth of material for feeding men's souls and guiding them in daily life.

The influence of the Bible in the making of our civilization is a threadbare theme. No doubt exaggerated statements have been made. In particular, credit has been given to the Bible for things that have come down to us rather from the ancient civilizations of Greece and Rome. Yet it is safe to say that what the Christian Scriptures have done, in nineteen centuries, in the way of molding the lives of men and the life of a large part of humanity, has been immeasurably greater than most of us realize. The influence stands out clearly in a case like Lincoln's, where there were few competing books. Yet even where it is not readily traced it is likely to have made itself felt. Whether or not we know it, and whether or not we welcome it, the influence of the New Testament is a part of the heritage of nearly every one of us. Our fathers found nourishment in it, if not we.

CHAPTER II

MODERN STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT—THE SCHOLAR'S METHOD

A. The Modern Outlook and Method in General.

The word, "scientific," better than any other word, sums up our modern approach to things. We have a passion to be "made knowing," which is the etymological meaning of the word. Upon beginning any investigation or undertaking the instinct which first asserts itself, in the truly modern man, is to marshal the data—get before him the facts. The particular enterprise may have to do with the making of automobiles, the blotting out of yellow fever, or the understanding of a piece of ancient literature: the general approach, in each case, is the same. And few will question that it is a right and proper approach. Ignorance and haphazard knowledge are not the only enemies of mankind, but they are among the worst. Little progress can be made in any direction until they have been recognized as enemies and at least partially overcome.

The worst that can fairly be said of the scientific method, as applied in any field, is that it is unnecessary —that fuller and more exact knowledge is not required. It is possible to say this of the Bible—to hold that it explains and expounds itself quite sufficiently. But what we have seen as to its use in the past will have made this view seem dubious.

B. Criticism—Biblical and Otherwise.

The modern scholar's method of studying the New

Testament is the scientific method. There is also another term, "critical," which is often applied to it. The use is accurate, but unfortunate. The words "criticism," "critical," and related terms have two quite distinct uses, but the fact is not generally recognized. In ordinary popular usage to criticize means to "find fault with," while criticism is "harsh or unfavorable judgment." But more technically, especially in connection with art and literature, criticism means "painstaking investigation"—examination or study of a detailed and thorough, as opposed to a haphazard, sort. It scarcely need be said that Biblical criticism belongs to the latter class, and it will at once appear that the critical method and the scientific method are essentially the same—or, in other words, the critical method is the logical way of going to work to satisfy the scientific passion for full possession of the facts.

C. The Lower, or Textual, Criticism.

There is special use for criticism in the case of ancient literature, since the facts about it are likely to have been more or less lost in the passing of the centuries. And the first problem that will confront the critic will be the problem of making sure that the work which lies before him is a faithful copy of what the original writer wrote. It is here that the lower, or textual, criticism has its field.

If the work happens to be one of Aristotle's it will have been put into circulation some eighteen hundred years before printing came into use. If it is a collection of Paul's letters the period will have been around fourteen centuries. The copy in the modern student's hands may seem old, but it will not be nearly old enough to bridge those vast periods. It will be a copy of a copy of a copy, etc.—with an untold number of generations back of it. It happens that the oldest manuscripts of the New Testament which we possess bear marks of having been written some three centuries after Mark and Luke and the

others had penned their books. And the fact that our oldest manuscripts are copies of copies means that they are imperfect copies. If this statement needs verification it can be had by comparing some of the copies which we have and discovering that even those which are oldest and most nearly alike have numerous differences in small details. No doubt they would be found to differ still more from the original, could we examine it. In this age of printing many thousands of copies of a book may be made and all be exactly alike. But when the hand-copying process had to be used the case was quite different.

It is true that after a book had come to be regarded as sacred, so that special effort was made to keep it from being in any way changed, it was copied and recopied with a minimum of deviation. But it was likely to have undergone more or less radical changes before this era of special safeguarding began. The period back of our earliest New Testament manuscripts, between the first century and the fourth, was the period in which, by a gradual process, these miscellaneous Christian writings were gravitating together and taking form as a new Scripture, supplementing and outranking the old, *i.e.* the "Old Testament." More of this later. The point to be noted here is that of all periods in the history of our New Testament this is the one in which its materials would be handled with greatest freedom, in which the greatest changes would be likely to be made. Not until the period was well advanced do we find the conception of a uniform and "closed" New Testament expressing itself in what might be called a standard type of text.

Evidence of what was going on in these centuries of course is not furnished by our Greek manuscripts, since the oldest of them does not take us back so far. But we do have evidence. In the second and third centuries the New Testament writings were being translated from Greek, the language in which nearly all of them were writ-

ten, into other languages—notably into Latin, Syriac, and the Egyptian dialects. Copies of these translations, mostly in fragmentary form, have come down to us, and it is possible to learn a good deal from them as to the readings that prevailed in this or that part of the Mediterranean world at the time when the translations were being made. Of great interest and importance, also, is the evidence which the writings of the early church fathers have to offer us. Extensive works of Justin, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and other fathers of the second, third, and fourth centuries have come down to us. These writers quote largely from the earlier writings which we have in the New Testament, and the wording of these quotations gives much information as to how Justin's Matthew, or Clement's Romans, read.

To sift this mass of evidence and draw conclusions from it that will command acceptance in this age, with its high standards of scientific accuracy and thoroughness, is not an easy task. It is to be remembered that the early translations and the writings of the fathers, as well as the Greek New Testament itself, are known to us only through copies, the original manuscripts having perished long ago. This hampering circumstance goes with the investigator from first to last. On the other hand the wealth of materials, while adding to the labor, have made it possible to reach results which could be viewed with confidence. The number of surviving manuscripts of the New Testament, ranging in content from a few verses to the whole, runs to several thousand—far more than in the case of any of the Greek or Latin classics, or any other writings that have come down to us from the ancient world.

Such is the field of textual criticism as applied to the New Testament. It has been worked with great thoroughness from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries, and with unusually satisfactory results. Simon, Mill,

Bentley, Bengel, Wettstein, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Westcott, Hort, Von Soden—these have been the outstanding workers, and to technical students of the New Testament theirs are honored names. In the English-speaking world our greatest debt is to Westcott and Hort, two British scholars whose labors extended through the latter part of the nineteenth century.

What these scholars have made clear is that, in those early centuries of which we were speaking, the New Testament writings were being circulated in three more or less distinct types of text. Two of these appear early, the third relatively late. By the fourth century the third was ousting the others, and it held the field for some fifteen hundred years. It is the type of text which our King James version presents to us. As compared with the two other types it is markedly a *full* text, seemingly reflecting the feeling that where there were different readings it was better to preserve both, as far as possible, so that nothing should be lost. Thus the closing verse of Luke, in one of the earlier types of text, reads, "and were continually in the temple, blessing God" (Lk. 24:53). In the other of the two earlier types it reads, "and were continually in the temple, praising God." In the third, later, type we have, "and were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God." This provides a simple illustration of the *conflated* readings which are characteristic of the third type of text.

Of course according to our modern ideas the thing of first importance is not that the New Testament should be *full,* but that it should be accurate. Textual criticism has therefore pretty definitely repudiated the third type of text, the type which Westcott and Hort labeled "Syrian." One of the two earlier types they called "Neutral," the other "Western." The Neutral text was their preference, as the name suggests. They thought that it

was more nearly original—free from influences tending to cause change—than the Western, and for the most part later opinion has supported them in this. This type of text is preserved for us in two great fourth-century manuscripts, known as Codex B (Vaticanus) and Codex Aleph (Sinaiticus). It also finds support in other Greek manuscripts and in translations and writings of fathers earlier in date. English readers have it before them in the Revised Version, which was greatly influenced, in this particular, by the work of Westcott and Hort.

From a practical point of view the great achievement of textual criticism has not been the demonstration that the Revised Version type of New Testament is nearer the original than the Authorized Version type, important and convincing though that has been in the scholar's view. The great achievement has been the proving—if so strong a word may be used—that such changes as the New Testament writings underwent in their early history were not vital; that we have, in all essentials, what the several writers actually wrote. The variations, *e.g.* between the Authorized Version and the Revised Version, run far into the thousands, a fact which in former days looked important, not to say serious, in its bearing on the ethical and theological use of the New Testament. But those former days have passed. Now that we have outgrown the detached and undiscriminating use of New Testament matter for the purpose of annihilating our theological enemies, and proving that the dogmatic tenets of the denomination into which we happened to be born are the only ones which can save men's souls, the matter has taken on a different aspect. Our present concern is, or ought to be, with the great ideas, thoughts, and personalities which the New Testament, understood in the light of its historical background, has for us, and these are seldom affected by the variations which textual study reveals. In fact what textual criticism has revealed as

to the existence of these variations has done more than almost anything else to show how untenable old views of the New Testament were, and how unjustifiable old practices.

This "lower" criticism is foundation work. To change the figure, it is a clearing of the field for larger studies—for the investigation of problems broader and farther reaching in character. And, speaking broadly and generally, that work is now done—the field is cleared. Studies in textual criticism are still being carried on. But the chance of new results of great importance or interest being reached is very slight. We of the present generation may safely assume that the Westcott & Hort Greek Testament which lies before us, or the Revised Version in English, if we cannot use the Greek, is, with sufficient exactness, the real New Testament, and we may therefore proceed with its study and use.

D. The Higher Criticism.

What is meant by "higher" will require little explanation, in view of what has already been said. Like the term *criticism* itself, it is accurate but scarcely felicitous. Either term, put to this unfamiliar use, is likely to cause offense. Small wonder that the combination of the two has created false impressions and has caused excitement and indignation that were scarcely justified. For higher criticism is simply scientific investigation which has reached a stage beyond that of the textual critic's work. It has to do with such matters as the origin, the literary form, and the value of the writing under view. It is a method of study, and if the person who uses the method takes the attitude of being "higher" than the writer whom he studies, he will not be more truly a higher critic on that account.

It is not necessary that we should discuss higher criticism at length at this point, for the reason that we shall

be using, and exemplifying, it almost constantly as we proceed. At least we shall try to use and exemplify it. To say this is only to say that we shall take our task seriously—that in discussing the several phases of our subject we shall make an honest and earnest effort to bring to bear upon each the best thought and knowledge of our day. To do otherwise would be unworthy of the subject, and an unworthy service of the God who gives us light.

Of course the view of the critical method which this book will give will be popular rather than technical. In the main it will be results—only in a lesser degree processes—that will be shown. And this may perhaps give the impression that the processes are simpler—the results more easily attained—than is actually the case. The fact is that to get a clear view of the background of ancient writings is likely to be very difficult. Sometimes it is quite impossible. The absence of such information as is furnished by title-page and preface in a modern book, the frequent untrustworthiness of such data as titles or notes may give, the literary device of disguising the author's identity—these and like features are expected by the student of ancient life and thought. For the most part he understands them—sees that they were natural under the circumstances and in the times, but they hamper him just the same. They make it hard for him to see a particular writing in its original setting, hard to visualize the circumstances which called it forth. And until he can do this he lacks the most important key to the understanding of whatever in it may be hard to understand.

The critic does not despise external evidence, but he learns not to put too much trust in it. He is more than willing to give consideration to what this or that church father may have said about a book of the New Testament, but rather often he discovers that another father

says something different. The fathers lived in an age when current sayings and rumors were not sifted as they are to-day. Hebrews, for example, was understood by some fathers to have been the work of Paul. But Tertullian quotes from it as by Barnabas, while Origen quotes opinions attributing it to Luke and to Clement of Rome. The view that it was by Paul won the day, though there was no sufficient foundation for this view. Another example is furnished by the traditions that have come down to us about the later life of the Apostle John. Until rather recently it was almost universally believed that this apostle had removed to Ephesus and had lived there to a very advanced age, serving as a sort of over-bishop of the province of Asia and writing, during this period, the New Testament books which bear the name of John. This view was vouched for by no less early, competent, and widely distributed witnesses than Irenaeus of Lyons, Tertullian of Carthage, and Clement of Alexandria. But we now know of another tradition, to the effect that John, as well as his brother James, was put to death by the Jews. It seems to go back to Papias, an earlier witness than any of those cited for the other view. It may be mistaken, but at any rate we have to admit that we know less about the later life of John than we thought we knew.

It is internal evidence, usually, which yields best results. The words which a writer uses, his favorite phrases and expressions, the special interests which he consciously or unconsciously reveals, his theological views, the contemporary life and thought which his writing reflects—critical study of such evidence often yields surprisingly rich results. Sometimes it points pretty definitely to a particular author or date. But for practical purposes authorship and date are less important than is often supposed. If the general period of the book's composition can be determined, and the situation

which called it forth laid bare, the key to its correct understanding has been found. And that is the important point.

Failure to understand what has just been said is responsible, in part, for the feeling that the results of modern Biblical study are largely negative. The critical student will probably say that he knows Peter did not write 2 Peter, but he does not know who did write it. He is sure that it was not written in the first century, but just when it was written he cannot say. All this sounds thoroughly negative—destructive, if you please. But we have not gone far enough. If we continue to question our critical student he will sketch for us the background of this early Christian tract in a way that will contribute to the understanding of it far more than any affixing of a name and a date could have done. And so with other New Testament books. Whether one's interest in the subject is purely historical, as may be the case with the university professor, or purely practical, as is likely to be the case with the Sunday school teacher, there is every reason why the books of the New Testament should be made to *live*—their original settings, as far as possible, being reproduced and kept in view. And it is only through a critical study of the internal evidence that this can be brought about.

It is subtle material to work with, this internal evidence. There is room for error in plenty, and hasty judgments thrive in it. But happily there are many competent workers in the field (along with many that are incompetent). On the whole, Biblical scholarship may be said to compare favorably with modern effort in other directions—both in its use of the scientific method and in the importance of results thus far achieved. Assuredly those whose researches have to do with the God of the New Testament should not yield place, in zealous effort and loyalty to truth, to those who find God—

whether or not they recognize Him—in the rocks and in the stars.

E. The Scholar and the Average Man.

It is always hard for the trained expert and the untrained observer to see things eye to eye. Perhaps the difference between the outlook of the Biblical scholar and that of the average church member is not greater than that between professional and onlooker in other fields. But it is at any rate greater than it ought to be. There should at least be mutual respect and confidence. The scholar should realize that the Bible is something more than a body of material for scientific research. It is closely connected with religion, and therefore with other than intellectual aspects of life. He should remember that it is possible for a person with no scholarly equipment whatever to be an expert in religion beyond what the scholar can claim. And not seldom this carries with it a sense of eternal values in Scripture which, within its proper limits, is keen and sound. On the other hand, the rank and file should realize that there is a vitally important place, in the study of the Bible, for technical scholarship. But for the safeguard which it offers there is constant danger of the use of Scriptures becoming a curse instead of a blessing—an aid to selfish and obscurantist interests instead of a source of inspiration and guidance in the onward and upward way. The tendency for men to "wrest" Scripture, to their own and others destruction (cf. 2 Peter 3:16) is as old as Scripture itself. It creates a problem which the Christian church has wrestled with through all its history. Attempts to correct the evil by applying the heavy hand of authority have failed and are discredited. To-day we are trying a new method. It is the method of free inquiry, based on the belief that if the Bible is studied in

unhampered fashion, by many trained minds, the truth from it and about it will emerge and prevail. But it will prevail only as it is known and sympathetically viewed—which means that scholars and people must be in friendly accord.

CHAPTER III

MODERN STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT—METHODS FOR NON-TECHNICAL STUDY

A. Value in Merely Reading the New Testament.

The New Testament is a body of great literature, and like all great literature it is, to a degree, independent of technical interpretation. It speaks directly to the human mind and heart, requiring no mediating pen or voice. We all know men and women of upright lives and beautiful spirit who have been lifelong Bible readers. That their characters have been molded by their reading we do not doubt, though it was probably of a sort to which the term "study" could scarcely be applied. The writings which make up the New Testament are rich in food for the moral and spiritual natures of men, and much of that food is readily appropriated, even by those whose mental equipment and training may be only average, or less. It is largely this quality which in the providence of God has won for these books their unique position, and which has made it possible for them to hold that position and exert immeasurable influence down through the Christian centuries. They are books which abundantly repay reading, with simple attentiveness, as well as the precise and detailed study which a trained student may bring to them.

B. Insufficiency of This Method of Use.

It is insufficient, for one thing, because there are very considerable parts of the New Testament's treasures to

which it furnishes no key. Mark and Luke and Paul were men of the first century; their present-day readers belong to the twentieth. If we could grasp the significance of this fact little else would need to be said. The New Testament is a great source book, both for history and for religion. But to avail oneself, in any large way, of its wealth of materials the modern user must bring to its interpretation not only a general familiarity with the thought of the ancient world, but a great deal of more special knowledge as well. This means, very decidedly, that his approach to it will have to be that of the student rather than the casual reader. One who has been merely a reader may think that he knows the New Testament fairly well. But he quickly realizes, upon passing to the student stage, that his previous knowledge has been very one-sided and limited. The casual reader of the Book of Revelation is likely to conclude that the most of it is meaningless for him. The more sane and sensible he is the more certainly will this be his conclusion. But upon devoting serious study to it, with the aid of knowledge which modern scholarship has made available, he will find its general sense and purport unfolding themselves most auspiciously. The Gospel according to John may seem to stand at the opposite pole from Revelation, in that its language is simple and clear. But the simplicity is deceptive. Serious study is indispensable if one is to more than scratch the surface of this great but somewhat baffling book. In the case of any book in the New Testament, serious study will be found to add greatly to what casual reading can yield.

There is also another, perhaps more important, point. Serious study is needed not only to supplement but to correct what ordinary reading yields. One great weakness in ordinary Bible reading is that too often it fails to realize its limitations. Lacking a realization of the difference between the thought world of the first century

and that of the twentieth, and viewing Scripture in the detached and undiscriminating way which he has inherited, the reader takes from his reading ideas that are as unprofitable for him and his age as they are opposed to the spirit of the New Testament. Here as always ignorance which is not recognized as ignorance is the most dangerous kind. Revelation once more furnishes examples in plenty. We may smile with tolerance at fantastic interpretations of the "666," the antichrist, etc. that have come down to us from the past. But when, in our own day, equally fantastic ideas are drawn from this book, the error is less easy to excuse. The modern reader is not to be blamed for not knowing what some of the imagery in Revelation means. But his not knowing that he does not know, and failing to surmise that his equipment is inadequate for the interpretation of such a book, with this we may justly find fault. Some serious study, scientific in method, would certainly teach him a good deal about the book, and it should have the added merit of teaching him a becoming humility.

C. The Historical and the Practical Points of View.

It is the non-technical student whom we have now in view—the minister without markedly scholarly equipment or tastes, the Sunday School teacher, or the "man in the pew" who may have decided to study the New Testament. Will the underlying purpose of the study, in the case of such students, be dominantly historical or practical? In the great majority of cases it will be dominantly practical. If the study is in the Gospels, for example, the student's main interest probably will not be to add to his knowledge of history, though he thinks of the Gospels as historical books. His more particular aim will be to gain matter that will be useful for the guidance of life—useful for himself or for those whom he directs. It follows that in his study he will inevitably

look for such material. Matter of seemingly little practical value will be passed by with little attention—though it may loom rather large in the narrative.

There is a danger here which the serious-minded student ought to recognize, that he may be fore-armed. He is right in desiring to be practical, but he should realize that this desire tends to give him a distorted view. If he is not careful the Jesus who emerges from his gospel studies will be a figure who incarnates—more, it may be, than the actual Jesus did—what seem to the student to be the truest thoughts and the highest ideals. That this is more than an imaginary danger there is abundant evidence to show. In the "lives" of Jesus, and in innumerable other works about him, men have paid him the tribute of making him the embodiment and mouthpiece of their own ideals. The ideals, probably, have been more often good than bad. The sending of them forth in books has, let us hope, been productive of more good than ill. But the procedure has not been such as to reveal and clarify the real history. Certainly all his would-be biographers have not been right as to what manner of person Jesus was.

We must not surrender the practical point of view. To do so would rob the Bible of the greater part of its value for humanity. And neither must we surrender the historical. To do so would deprive us of the best means which we have of checking vagaries of interpretation—of securing a use of the Bible which will be trustworthy and sane. It is indeed the only means to this end which our modern world will tolerate, or ought to tolerate. How can both be retained? Only by giving first place to the historical. Unless we seriously try to see the material as it is—to include in our view not only what we may like best but what is there—we are thus far unworthy to be called students of the New Testament.

But will not practical interests suffer, if the handling

of the Bible is restricted so rigorously? There is no reason why they should. What is insisted upon here is merely that when we are interpreting the New Testament we should interpret the New Testament. As for the rest, "God is not dumb, that He should speak no more," as Lowell has reminded us.

D. Two Fundamentals.

These have already been suggested indirectly: (1) Familiarity with the writings themselves; (2) Knowledge of their background and purpose. In these two points pretty much the whole matter of Bible study may be summed up. They are fundamental not only in the sense that they are necessary as a foundation for any special investigation, but in the larger sense that they themselves cover the essential ground. The rest is easy, when these two points have been gained.

It may be that there was a time when the first point, familiarity with the writings, could be taken for granted, at least in the case of Sunday School teachers or students entering the ministry. If so that time has passed. Many students now enter theological seminaries with a knowledge of the contents of the Bible that is very scanty indeed. It is beside the point to blame them, or blame anybody, for this. What is important is that the student should avoid the error of supposing that he can acquire the modern view of the Bible satisfactorily without a knowledge of the Bible itself. If he is deficient in this respect he should face the fact squarely and take immediate steps to remedy it. Bible teachers in the seminaries and elsewhere have to presuppose a great deal in the way of familiarity, on the part of pupils, with the bare matter of the books which they teach. Usually no other course is possible where instruction is above the grammar school grade. It is a simple matter for the student to familiarize himself with the general contents of the

book being taught, and whether or not he does so will largely determine what the course of study will mean to him.

The importance of this matter can scarcely be overemphasized. To teach the contents of the Bible as sufficient to itself, with an attitude of indifference or hostility to the background which modern knowledge reveals, is a serious error. But the equipment of him who learns something both of the background and the modern view, while knowing little of the actual contents, is not less weak.

The second point requires little emphasis. It goes with our whole modern view of things that we study phenomena in their relation to other phenomena, in the settings in which we find them, in the spheres in which they operate. Until we understand the New Testament writings as products of their times we do not understand them at all. They belong to the history of the early church, and it is there that we must look for them if we would see them alive. The theology which came from Paul's pen, and the history which Luke wrote, were timely as well as timeless, and except as we see for ourselves their timeliness our conviction as to their timelessness will be formal and unreal.

E. The Use of "Helps."

(a) *The Available Supply.* The number of books in circulation which are designed to aid, in one way or another, in the study of the Bible is very great—appallingly great, one might be disposed to say. And the printing presses continue to pour them forth. The amount of material prepared for Sunday School use is itself enormous. More or less closely related to it are the publications intended for teachers' training classes, week-day vacation Bible schools, and other phases of the religious education movement in its more recent devel-

opment. Then there are textbooks for college use, and of course there exists a very extensive literature about the Bible prepared for the reading public in general. The prospective student will not be embarrassed by a dearth of materials, but rather by the difficulty of choosing when "helps" in such numbers offer their services. If he is enrolling in a regular course of study—under denominational or other organized auspices—the choice will probably be made for him by those who have the matter in charge. Where this is not the case the student will do well to seek expert advice from some source in which he can have confidence. Some general suggestions here, as to the scholarship which a book represents and the materials which it offers, may be of use.

(b) *As to the Scholarship Represented.* Many of the books about the Bible represent no scholarship. These may be useful, or worse than useless, in their sphere. In either case we pass them by, since it is serious study which we have in view. Other books represent scholarship, but of an earlier generation than ours. Here again, whether we shall seek help from such material will depend on our point of view. If we judge that finality in Bible study was reached at some point in the more or less distant past, and that therefore the task of the present-day student is simply to appropriate what has thus been handed down, then this type of literature may be trusted to give us what we want. But in any case the student should realize how the matter stands. Publishers have a habit of advertising old books, or new ones written from an old point of view (which are seldom as good as the old ones), as if they were the last word of scholarship.

We may assume that in the case of a great majority of present-day students the Biblical helps which will be wanted will be those which represent present-day scholarship. This, to be sure, does not reduce the matter to

entire simplicity. For one thing, a new book of learned appearance, as already suggested, does not necessarily embody the scholarship of to-day. It would be easy to make a considerable list of books on Biblical subjects, written twenty to thirty years ago, which represent the modern point of view much more fully and accurately than do other books just off the press. Again, there are books being published to-day which are too advanced in their views, too revolutionary to be representative of present-day scholarship. A generation hence they may be regarded as standard, or they may be discredited and forgotten. As to that we cannot say. What we know, and what the student should realize, is that they do not represent the consensus of competent opinion to-day. There are many books which do represent that consensus, though they differ in details, and it is to such books mainly that the thoughtful student will look for help.

(c) *As to the Material Offered.* Roughly speaking, the material offered by these Biblical helps is of three kinds: (1) Introduction; (2) Explanation; (3) Application. A particular book is likely to include more than one of these kinds of material, though one of the three will probably dominate. In a commentary of the average type it is the explanation element which dominates, though introductory matter usually has a larger or smaller place at the beginning of the book. In the more technical commentaries, such as those of the *International Critical* series, "application" is almost entirely absent, while at the opposite extreme are the popular and homiletical commentaries in which the lessons to be drawn from the Biblical material are the main thing. This is even more true of a large class of other works, including volumes of sermons, books of devotions, etc., in which Scripture passages are used as a basis or starting point for discourses designed to furnish guidance or inspiration for life.

At present the first, introductory type of Biblical helps seems to be more than ever to the fore. The material of the Bible dictionaries and encyclopedias is almost entirely of this character, and during the past generation the value of these works has been increasingly recognized. In the one-volume *Commentary on the Bible,* edited by Professor Peake, we have a work in which a large number of introductory essays are interspersed with brief expositions of the matter of each of the Biblical books. The great popularity of this work would seem to be due to the value found in the introductory matter. at least to this feature as much or more than to the necessarily sparse comments on the separate books. One readily recalls also that the books on Biblical subjects which have attracted great popular attention in recent years have been mainly of the introductory type: such books as Bade's *The Old Testament in the Light of To-day,* and Moffatt's *The Approach to the New Testament,* etc.

On the whole this type is to be recommended to the intelligent student more than any other. Such works—particularly the abler ones of the class—will help him to orient himself in the ancient thought world which forms the background of the Biblical history and literature. They will also furnish a wealth of information on such specific matters as are essential to the understanding of the miscellaneous writings and groups of writings of which the Bible is made up. If the student wants help all the way—in the interpretation of every passage and in its application to practical life and needs—he will have to turn to books of a different character. But he will do well to consider whether these things should not be his own contribution. The keeping of a proper balance between dependence and independence in his studies is a fine art which he will need to cultivate, and in making

largest use of the introductory type of helps he will be safeguarding his independence of thought in an important way.

We may note in passing that the religious education movement in our time shows a tendency to avail itself increasingly of materials from outside the Bible. In the past the prevailing idea has been that the education of children and adults in Christian truth—inculcating in them the Christian view of life and duty—should be based on the Bible, or on the historic creeds which were assumed to epitomize and explain what the Bible taught. Other materials were used only by way of further explaining and supplementing these. At present one notes that this process is not seldom reversed. There is a disposition to outline courses of study as scientific educational principles—not Biblical materials—may dictate, and to use in the teaching of such courses matter Biblical or extra-Biblical in origin. Presumably those who arrange such courses are guided by fundamental Christian principles, or what they conceive to be such, in their choice of materials. This is a significant development, and we shall do well to watch it with interest. That it gives cause for alarm does not appear. It is the duty of each age to bring to the service of God and of truth the best that it has. As between this tendency and the alternative of compelling the Bible to fit itself into our molds, he who honors his Bible should not find it hard to choose. We are brought back again to the difference between the historical and the practical points of view (cf. above, p. 28). The point of view of Bible study should be primarily historical; of religious education (as it is called) primarily practical. We have scarcely yet begun to grasp this fact. As we grasp it more fully it may be expected that courses in both Bible study and religious education will yield better results.

F. Summary and Conclusion.

We may summarize briefly the most important points: The fundamentals in Bible study are two—familiarity with the writings themselves, and knowledge of the background from which they came and the purpose which called them forth. To attain this familiarity and this knowledge is a worthy goal of earlier studies, and a necessary foundation for later ones. Mere reading may be of great value, especially as it should yield a wide acquaintance with the contents of the books. But study must follow reading, else the second of the two requirements cannot be met. If he is to go far in his Bible studies the student will require the help of other books. They should by preference be books which represent present-day scholarship, and which offer general introduction to the Biblical literature and its problems rather than detailed explanation and application of passages. The term "background" as here used is to be broadly understood. One of the most prevalent and most fatal of all weaknesses in the use of the New Testament is a failure to understand the thought world in which the man of the first century lived and moved. No amount of detailed knowledge will make up for deficiency at this point. The goal of his studies will be to gain a correct understanding of what the several writers wrote. If he expects to put the results of his studies to practical use—in preaching, teaching, or otherwise—he will need to be very careful that this intended use does not stand in the way of their accuracy or inclusiveness. The practical instinct must not be allowed to stand in the way of the historical.

Yet some of the twenty-seven "books" which make up the New Testament repay study much more richly than do others. This is true from the historical, and even more true from the practical, point of view. When the preacher or Sunday School teacher is studying a

New Testament book or character he should try to get a fair and somewhat adequate view of it, to see it not as a reflection of ideas which he brings to it, but as it is. But this principle need not prevent his giving special attention to the books and the characters which for his purpose are most worth while. To study these with zeal and thoroughness will be far more fruitful than an undiscriminating study of the New Testament material from beginning to end. From the point of view of practical usefulness to-day there are two things which are most worth gaining from a study of the New Testament: the spirit of its great figures, and the outstanding thoughts which its writers have to present. And one may concentrate on these without doing violence to the history.

PART II

THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER IV

A MISSIONARY'S LETTERS: THE BEGINNING OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

A. Introductory (to Chapters 4-6).

In past centuries men have very generally believed that their sacred books were divine in a direct and simple sense. The finger of God had written them, or at any rate the human hand that wielded the pen had been under the divine Spirit's direct control, so that the words were not the writer's own. The Scripture writers were as passive in the control of the Spirit as is the flute in its player's hands. This was a figure often used. Angels were frequently supposed to have had a part in bringing the sacred writings to earth, and there were other supernatural accompaniments. In such ways did men try to express their sense of the value which their Scriptures possessed. To the modern man, who has learned that God's greatest gifts come in what we call natural ways, the matter looks different. He would not ascribe a contra-natural origin to the New Testament if he could, and he could not if he would. He could not because he knows, or may readily know, the facts. The twenty-seven writings which make up our New Testament were written by men of the early church, some of them of greater, some of less prominence. Each of these men was in touch with the situation and needs of one or more of the scattered communities of Christians, and each wrote with the purpose of giving to these

Christians what he believed to be needed information, inspiration, exhortation, or advice. These are the essential facts.

The situation and needs were in no two cases exactly alike, so that in a sense there are twenty-seven answers to the question of how the New Testament writings came to be. But by a grouping process the presentation may be simplified. Such a grouping is here outlined, and is followed in this and the next two chapters. Those writings are grouped together which were called forth by like situations. The order of the groups is roughly chronological, though it will be seen that the last five groups overlap a good deal. The arrangement of the books in each group also is intended to be chronological, but in the case of a few books we cannot be certain as to just where they belong.

Group 1. Letters of Paul to new Christian congregations outside of Palestine. Range of dates about 50-65 A. D. (1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, Galatians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Romans, Colossians, Ephesians, Philemon, Philippians).

Group 2. Accounts of how Christianity began, with one account of how it was extended as far afield as Rome. About 70-100 A. D. (Mark, Matthew, Luke, Acts.)

Group 3. Messages to Christian groups suffering persecution at the hands of the Roman government. About 80-95 A. D. (1 Peter, Hebrews, Revelation.)

Group 4. Epistles and notes on congregational doctrine and discipline; including some fragments of Paul's correspondence, but belonging to a generation later than his. About 90-115 A. D. (2 Timothy, Titus, 1 Timothy, 2 John, 3 John.)

Group 5. "Tracts for the times" (in letter form), rebuking current errors in doctrine and conduct and

setting forth the better way. About 100-150 (James, Jude, 2 Peter).

Group 6. A reinterpretation of the life of Jesus, in the light of Paul's teachings and of a broader outlook (less distinctively Jewish, more philosophical and mystical) than that of the earlier accounts. About 100-125 (John, 1 John).

B. Paul's Problem of Religious Education.

We have come to realize in recent years the important place of "religious education" in the propagation of Christianity. Paul, missionary to the Gentiles, arrived at this realization long ago. The matter of instructing his converts was very much on his heart. There was much in the Jewish heritage of Christianity which he wanted them to know about and make their own. There were other things in it, such as trusting in circumcision and other mechanical forms, which he wished them to keep free from as contrary to the true spirit of Christianity. The Jewish Scriptures (now our Old Testament) were rather widely known among non-Jews before Christianity came on the scene. Many of Paul's converts were more or less acquainted with them. It was now necessary that they should know them better, particularly that they should be led to see how they contributed to Christian beliefs and Christian life. Further, there were the Gentile ideas and practices to be dealt with: the background of these new converts could not be ignored. Paul knew that there was much of good in this background. This must be conserved and turned to the service of Christianity. There was also much that was not good. This must be made to appear in its true light, that his converts might themselves condemn it and deny it a place in their lives and thought.

But if Paul was interested in religious education he had another even more dominant interest. He was at

heart a pioneer. Sometimes he would stop for months in a place, even for one or more years. But this was unusual. Laying foundations was his specialty. He preferred to work "not where Christ was already named." To preach the gospel "unto the parts beyond" was ever his dream and his plan. Such a program gave little chance for the work of education, which is necessarily slow. But Paul could not escape the sense of responsibility. He was the sort of man who makes friends as well as converts, and these new-found friends—back in Thessalonica, or Corinth, or the churches of Galatia—were still in his thoughts after he had passed to other fields. He wrote to them. Occasionally he wrote also to the churches which he had not visited but in which for some reason he felt a special interest. They were such letters as only a great friend and a great Christian could write. He recalled the past and gave counsel for the future. He expounded to them such matters of belief and practice as he thought they needed, aiming to strengthen them where they were weak. If he had had recent word from them or about them, as was usually the case, he made the news which he had received the starting point for much of what he wrote. Sometimes it was encouraging, sometimes depressing, news. In either case Paul reacted to it with his whole soul. Such appreciation as his has seldom found expression from human pen, yet searching were his condemnations, bitter his rebukes. "Anxious care for all the churches" weighed daily upon his mind (2 Cor. 11:28), and in using the pen as an aid in meeting these heavy responsibilities he was doing more than he realized. He was laying foundations for a new Scripture which would have a value and an influence beyond all precedent.

C. 1 and 2 Thessalonians.

The Thessalonian letters, it would seem, were written

first. After launching the Christian movement in this Macedonian city Paul had gone down to Athens, and from there to Corinth (Acts 17:1-18:5). Here Timothy, who had worked with him at Thessalonica, joined him again, bringing cheering news of how things were going in the infant church. It was with this good news fresh in his mind that Paul wrote 1 Thessalonians. The situation had been critical, owing largely to Jewish hostility. Paul himself had been compelled to flee from the city, and since he left efforts had been made to defame his character. But Paul is delighted to hear that his converts have lost neither their affection for him nor their loyalty to Christ. He writes in defense of his record among them, in affectionate gratitude, and in eager solicitude that they may grow in the knowledge and practice of their new-found faith. One paragraph in the letter (4:13-5:11) is in answer to a particular question, of vital interest, which had arisen in these new disciples' minds. Christ would return before long, in the lifetime of most of them. So Paul believed, and so he had taught them. But already, since they became Christians, several of their number had passed away. What of them? Must they lose their share in the triumphs and privileges that would follow the Coming of the Lord? Paul gives reassuring counsel on this point. The dead shall rise at the Coming—these loved ones shall be abundantly provided for. Meanwhile let the living be ready, awaiting their Lord with sober confidence.

Their expectation of Christ's return was no doubt a source of comfort and strength to early Christians in times of stress. But it was a mistaken expectation, and it was capable of being a source of weakness and confusion at times. We see this clearly in 2 Thessalonians, written apparently only a few weeks or months after the earlier letter. It is not true, Paul now insists, that "the

Day of the Lord is *just at hand.*" The notion is both false and mischievous. Those Thessalonians who are wasting their time in idleness, awaiting the Lord's return, must get to work. Paul speaks sharply on this point. Certain dire events have yet to intervene before the Coming, and while they wait Christ's people are to do with diligence what is given them to do. Paul was not infallible in his ideas, but he had an unfailing fund of energy and of common sense.

D. Galatians.

Paul found Corinth a fruitful field for his missionary work, so much so that he stayed there one and a half or two years (Acts 18:1-18). Upon leaving he visited Jerusalem, Antioch, and other Christian centers, and then established his headquarters for several years at Ephesus (Acts 18:18-19:41). To this general period of his activities Galatians belongs. It may have been written from Antioch, though we cannot be sure. It is addressed to "the churches of Galatia" (1:2), by which is probably meant the Christian communities which Paul had founded in the region of Antioch (in Pisidia), Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe (Acts 13:13-14:28), a region which was included in the Roman province of Galatia.

In the Thessalonian letters we get just a hint of Paul's fighting spirit; in Galations we get much more than a hint. It is a fairly long letter, and little outside help is needed in order to understand the general situation back of it. Since Paul had last visited these churches they had been visited by other Christian missionaries who had denied Paul's authority and declared that the gospel which he preached was not the true gospel. These missionaries probably came from Jerusalem. At any rate they held to a strongly Jewish type of Christianity. The issue between them and Paul was whether such Jewish rites as circumcision, the observance of feast days, etc.,

were essential to the new faith, so as to be binding upon non-Jewish converts as well as upon Jewish Christians who chose to continue observing them. To Paul it was a vital issue. He himself was a Jew with a profound sense of the greatness of the national heritage, yet he declares to the Galatians that a Christianity in which Jewish rites and ceremonies are made essential is, by so much, a religious bondage like that of the heathen religions which they have given up (4:8-11). Christianity is not a mechanical scheme—of salvation or anything else. It is a life with God in Christ with active good will as the outward expression of that inner life. As Paul puts it: "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith working through love" (5:6). It is upon this that he takes his stand. The issue is still with us, and in a sense Galatians is the most "modern" of the New Testament books.

E. 1 and 2 Corinthians.

During his long stay in Ephesus (Acts 19) Paul wrote 1 Corinthians. Since he had left Corinth he had kept in touch with the Christian community which he had founded there. There had already been some correspondence back and forth (cf. 5:9; 7:1), and further information had reached Paul by word of mouth (cf. 1:11; 16:17; 5:1). The present letter is one of the longest in our collection of Paul's writings, and it might well have been longer; so many matters had to be discussed. Corinth was a heathen metropolis, and being true to Christian principles in such environment involved problems small and great. Sexual morality, with the marriage problem in various aspects; Christians going to law in pagan courts; factions in the church; women attending worship; how the Lord's Supper should be administered; "speaking with tongues" and other spiritual "gifts"; the use of foods that had been connected

with idol worship; the bodily resurrection of the dead; the gathering of money contributions for needy Christians in Jerusalem; thus wide is the range of doctrinal and practical matters of which this letter treats. Even where the discussion may seem purely theoretical—as Chapter 15, on the resurrection—or purely poetical—as Chapter 13, on love—it has in reality been called forth by concrete facts in the situation of the Christians for whom Paul wrote. In a Greek city there were certain to be those to whom the idea of a dead body rising to life would seem strange and unreal (cf. Acts 17:32). It was a Jewish doctrine, and Paul himself had somewhat of the Greek feeling that it was unsatisfactory; hence his explanation that it was a "spiritual body" which survived death, not the body of flesh and bones. Again, among the Corinthian converts the ecstatic utterance known as speaking with tongues was certain to appear a greater "gift" than the quiet virtue of brotherly love. Paul aimed to correct this false emphasis and produced a prose-poem that will never die. He wrote for the few, and served the many; he wrote for his time, and inspired men of all time.

When we pass to 2 Corinthians we soon realize that between the writing of the two letters things have happened of which we have no detailed knowledge. There may have been an intermediate visit to Corinth (cf. 2:1); certainly there had been an intermediate letter, vigorous and severe in character (cf. 2:4; 7:8). Exactly what the trouble was we do not know. We gather that there had been flagrant immorality in the Corinthian church (cf. 12:21); also that other missionaries, unfriendly to Paul and disputing his authority, had sowed seeds of dissatisfaction in the community (cf. 11:4, 22). At any rate relations between the church and its founder had become very strained, and the whole matter was extremely painful to Paul. After he had sent

off the severe letter he doubted if he should have written it; he feared that he had not handled the case in the best way. His plans called for a journey into Macedonia in the near future, and for a time he thought of going by way of Corinth to see if he could straighten matters out. The Corinthian Christians knew that he had this in mind, and when he finally abandoned the idea, fearing that a visit at that time would do more harm than good, yet another cause of misunderstanding had been created. The severe letter had been taken to Corinth by Titus, one of Paul's lieutenants, who no doubt had been instructed to supplement it with such personal influence as he could bring to bear. Meanwhile Paul left Ephesus for Macedonia, taking the direct route leading north. There had been a tentative arrangement that Titus should meet him at Troas, bringing the news from Corinth. Paul, sick at heart over the breach that had become so wide between him and his "children in Christ," looked forward to the meeting with mingled hope and anxiety. His lieutenant was not at Troas, but farther on, in Macedonia, he met him—and heard the best news that had reached him in many a day. The letter, and the mission of Titus, had been successful. Paul's opponents in Corinth had yielded or been silenced; the church was loyal and friendly once more (see 1:12-2:13; 6:11-13; 7:2-16).

Such is the background of 2 Corinthians. Paul wrote it in Macedonia, with the news brought by Titus in the forefront of his mind. It is perhaps harder to follow through with understanding than any other letter in the collection. The main reason for this we have seen: gaps in our knowledge of the circumstances which called it forth. Another cause of difficulty is the fact that Paul makes a great deal of use of "we" when he means himself, though at times using the pronoun in a more inclusive sense. Further trouble is caused by the fact that one

section (6:14-7:1) is out of place and interrupts the thought, while the last four chapters (10-13) do not follow at all naturally upon what precedes. The tone of the matter in these four chapters makes it seem likely that they belonged originally to the severe letter referred to above, and 6:14-7:1 also is probably a fragment from some other letter of Paul's.

2 Corinthians is somewhat of an enigma, but there is rich matter in it and it is worth wrestling with. A good free translation, like Moffatt's or Goodspeed's, will be found a great help.

F. Romans.

Romans, like Galatians, is largely self-interpreting. That is, its general drift, at least, may be understood apart from any particular knowledge of the circumstances that called it forth. Yet the setting of the letter is not without importance for the understanding of it. We left Paul in Macedonia, where 2 Corinthians was written. Not long afterward he went down to Greece, presumably making the deferred visit to Corinth, now that friendly relations were restored (see Acts 20:1-2). At this time he was devoting particular attention to the gathering of a collection for the Christians in Jerusalem, having in mind not only the supplying of a physical need but also the fostering of a brotherly relationship between the Jewish and the Gentile wings of the church. In the Corinthian letters frequent reference is made to this task (see I Cor. 16:1ff.; 2 Cor. 8-9, etc.). When Romans was written it was completed, and Paul was soon to start for Jerusalem with the funds which he had secured. He was very likely in Corinth when he wrote. A turning point, he felt, had now been reached in his work. Thus far his activities had been confined to the eastern Mediterranean world, but in that region the pioneer work of planting Christianity in strategic centers

was now done. Paul was looking for other worlds to conquer, and Spain was particularly in his thought. One reason why a journey to Spain was alluring was because Rome lay on the way. Christianity had long since been planted in the great world capital—by whom we do not know. And it had flourished. "Your faith," Paul writes, "is proclaimed throughout the whole world" (1:8). He had long been interested in the Roman church and eager to visit it. Now, in connection with his contemplated shift of base from the eastern to the western Mediterranean region, it seemed that the hope would be realized. First he must go to Jerusalem, but once this duty was performed he would set his face toward the west (15:18-33).

Meanwhile he wrote a letter to Rome. Why? It is hard to say with certainty. It is quite possible that the Roman Christians had had previous intimation of Paul's intention to visit them, and that Paul now wished to acquaint them with later developments, which had delayed the carrying out of his plan. This would account for the sending of a letter, but it by no means fully accounts for such a letter as Paul actually wrote. When we read it we find it to be a development, at much greater length, of the theme of Galatians—that what Christianity offers is a spiritual union with God in Christ, available to Jew and Gentile on equal terms, and entirely independent of such external requirements as those of the Jewish Law (see esp. 3:21-22). It is a treatise rather than a letter, but by no means a rounded theology, and not even a treatise in the sense of being coldly intellectual. The most obvious thing about the discussion as a whole is that for the man who wrote it the subject was not academic; for him it had burning reality. What Paul says in Romans comes from his inmost soul. He here gives expression to convictions that were the product of years of intellectual and spir-

25069
225.061
E11g
THE CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY
LIBRARY

itual wrestlings, and other years of experience on the firing line of the Christian advance—convictions as to the place of Jew and non-Jew in God's purpose and as to the essential meaning of Christianity. Perhaps Paul had reason for believing that there was special need in the Roman church for such a message. It may be that he thought of it as preparing the way for his forthcoming visit. We do not know. We do know—though Paul at the time did not—that when he wrote Romans his pioneering days were ended. And we see in it a fitting valedictory.

G. The "Prison Epistles."

When Paul went to Jerusalem he was placed under arrest, and when he went to Rome it was as a prisoner. According to Acts (28:16, 30-31) the imprisonment was mild in form. Paul was allowed to secure a lodging of his own and live there under guard, visitors being admitted freely. Thus two years passed—the closing years, as is probable, of the great missionary's life. His movements were restricted but his pen was not silenced, and fortunately four letters from this period have been preserved to us.

(a) *Colossians.* As we turn the pages of this letter we realize that though the situation has changed we are in touch with the same Paul. "If ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why . . . do you subject yourselves to ordinances,—Handle not, nor taste, nor touch . . . ? If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above . . ." (2:20-21; 3:1). It is the familiar insistence that for the Christian external forms, whether Jewish or Gentile in origin, must not be allowed to stand in the way of those higher spiritual values in which Christianity essentially consists. Colossae was not far from Ephesus and the Galatian

churches, but Paul had not founded its Christian community. It had been founded, we gather, by Epaphras, a friend and probably a convert of Paul's, who now visits Paul with the news that things are not going well at Colossae. Wrong ideas have been disseminated in the church, with bad effects on its members, both as to their Christian beliefs and their moral lives. Such is the situation which Paul's letter tries to meet. The errors are various, but as Paul views the matter they all root in an inadequate sense of the all-sufficiency of Christ, hence it is to this point that he gives most emphasis. Just who the propagandists were who had caused the trouble we do not know, but the general sense of the letter is sufficiently clear (see 1:6-7; 4:12; 2:1; 2:8-10; etc.).

(b) *Ephesians.* Ephesians, like Romans, seems rather more like a treatise than a letter. And the subject matter for the treatise seems to have been taken from Colossians. The reader of the two letters is likely to get the impression that matter which in Colossians had been used for the special purpose of combating errors in a local church, in Ephesians is handled again in a broader and more general way. It is quite possible that this is the true explanation of the close similarity of the two. Tychicus, one of Paul's assistants, seems to have been the bearer of both letters, which suggests that they were written and sent at the same time (Col. 4:7-9; Eph. 6:21-22). But how shall we account for the detached, treatise-like tone of Ephesians when we recall that Paul was very well acquainted indeed at Ephesus? The answer is that the title "To the Ephesians" is a mistake. The words "at Ephesus" in the opening salutation (1:1) are absent from some of the oldest and most reliable manuscripts, and when we learn from 1:15 that the writer has merely "heard of" the Christian virtues of those to whom he writes we may be very sure that the

letter was not intended for Ephesus—not for this church specifically, at least (see also 3:2; 4:21; and cf. Acts 19; 20:17-38). Possibly Paul intended it as a circular letter to the churches in the general region of which Ephesus was the metropolis. There is a hint of such a letter in Colossians. The brethren of that place are told to expect another letter which will reach them "from Laodicea" by and by (Col. 4:16).

But if Ephesians is of more general character than most of Paul's letters it does not follow that its discussion is abstract. The theme of the greatness and all-sufficiency of Christ is shown to have very practical bearings. It carries with it the inclusion of the Gentiles in God's plan, and this in turn involves a great universal church with Christ as its Head. "The building up of the body of Christ," then, is the Christian's glorious task and privilege. Each has his part, the worthy performing of which demands knowledge, balance, zeal, and purity (see esp. Chapter 4). Ephesians is a noble piece of literature. It has a depth and richness which we have learned to expect from Paul, and it has also a smoothness of flow, a lofty evenness of tone and spirit, such as none other of the letters can show.

(c) *Philemon.* As Tychicus journeyed eastward from Rome he had as a traveling companion a man named Onesimus. This Onesimus was going to Colossae, and his errand was unusual. He was a runaway slave who had made good his escape to far-away Rome, but was now returning to his master, Philemon, a prosperous Christian of Colossae and a friend of Paul's. In Rome the runaway had somehow come under the influence of Paul, who found him helpful and became much attached to him. But both came to realize that the course for Onesimus, as a Christian, was clear. He must return. Our Philemon is the note which Paul sent with him—addressed to the master and expressing the confident

hope that he and his penitent slave would be fully reconciled. It is very short, but back of its few sentences we get a view of Paul, the man and the Christian, that is of striking vividness (see esp. verses 8-19; cf. Col. 4:7-9).

(d) *Philippians.* We have seen that three of the Prison Epistles seem to have been written at the same time and sent to the same region. Philippians is more detached. The Christian community at Philippi was the first which Paul had established in Europe (Acts 16:11-40), and through the intervening years a friendly relationship had been maintained. Since Paul had arrived in Rome, a prisoner, the good will of the Philippians toward him had been shown not only by inquiries as to his well-being but also in more substantial ways. Through one of their number, Epaphroditus, they had sent financial assistance to him. The return of Epaphroditus to Philippi had been delayed by serious illness, which had caused anxiety to all concerned. At length, however, he recovered enough to start upon the journey, and Paul wrote and sent with him a letter, to be delivered to the church when he arrived home. Such was the situation which produced Philippians (see 2:25-30; 4:10-20). There are breaks at several points which seem to indicate that it was not all written or dictated at once. Yet it is not hard to follow or to understand.

As in Colossians and Ephesians, so also here, the greatness of Christ is in the writer's thought. But here it is dwelt upon less at length and takes a particular turn. It was only after Christ had given up his previous glory and lived a lowly life that "God highly exalted him." From this is drawn a lesson in humility of which the Philippians apparently were in need (1:27-2:18). The fact that this letter, as compared with the other two, has a larger proportion of personal reference and miscellaneous advice, with less sustained development of a

theme, is easily accounted for by the different circumstances which called it forth.

In this letter Paul has a good deal to say about himself—his present situation and his plans and hopes. All of it is of deep interest, especially in view of the fact that the end was so near—the end not only of his missionary journeyings (as when Romans was written) but of his earthly pilgrimage. He is confident that he will be acquitted and released, yet from the other possibility he does not shrink. His own desire, indeed, would be "to depart and be with Christ, for it is very far better; yet to abide in the flesh is more needful for your sake." His goal of work has not been reached, and no more has his goal of Christian character. He is still "pressing on" toward what lies before (1:19-26; 3:4-14).

H. Conclusion.

Of such origin were Paul's letters; thus were produced the earliest writings of our New Testament. They were called forth by definite situations, and apart from those situations only a very imperfect understanding of them is possible. They are far from being works on systematic theology, and the writer was far from thinking of them as offering final solutions for all problems of all time. They are letters written or dictated by a busy man, and they show the marks of haste. Yet it is scarcely possible to exaggerate their worth. They are great as literature, but it is to their *religious* uniqueness that they owe their immortality. Where has religion—vital, practical religion, religion as a dynamic force—found another such champion? (And to Paul religion meant Christ.) The passionate conviction that fellowship with God is the one great reality, not an abstract reality but the source from which the life of the individual and of the world must flow, a reality so dominant in importance that even

those things which are intended to further it must be guarded lest they stand in its way—this conviction was incarnated in Paul. Those who in our own time share this conviction—be it moderately or intensely—have much to learn from him.

CHAPTER V

NARRATIVES OF CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

A. The Rise of Christian Narratives.

We pass now from the first to the second of the groups of writings which make up our New Testament. The need for religious education did not end with the death of Paul. It did, however, take on different aspects as time went on. And happily among the Christian leaders who survived Paul were some who were able, as he had been, to contribute in a literary way to the meeting of new needs as they arose. They wrote with the church of their own time—largely with local situations—in view; and in so doing they added unwittingly to what were destined to be the classics of Christianity. Two of the writers of the present group, as it happened, had been friends and associates of Paul's.

The books in this group were probably all written during the last third of the first century. When the earliest of them, Mark, appeared nearly all of the first generation of Christians had passed away; and it is likely that many of the original readers of Acts, the latest of the four, were three generations removed from those who had seen and followed Jesus in the flesh. And with this lapse of time the outlook had considerably changed. The fact that eye-witnesses were passing away—those who had been with Jesus or who had shared in the stirring events of the early days—this fact alone would go far to account for the increased interest which now arose in written records of how the Faith began.

And there were other reasons for this interest. One

was the fact that expectation of the speedy return of Jesus was growing dim. To the first generation this expectation was the central thing in Christianity. The past had little importance, since the immediate future loomed so large. What Jesus had been and done was overshadowed by what he was soon to be and do. His earlier mission had been only by way of preparation for his later coming in the clouds. Meanwhile the history of the Christian movement between his departure and his return was scarcely worth writing; it was merely an interim, soon to end. But this hope, as we know, was disproved by the lapse of time. Even in Paul's thought, we gather, it was less vivid toward the close of his life than it had been earlier. At any rate there are no such detailed references to it in his prison letters as in 1 and 2 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians. The realization of the mistake came gradually, and with it, naturally, came an attitude of greater interest in Christianity's past. To be sure, for a first-century Christian to feel this interest did not mean that he had completely abandoned the hope of the Return. As a matter of fact none of the writers of these narrative books had reached that point. It was rather that the expectation had lost its vividness. It no longer was felt to be a sufficient gospel, all else merely contributing to it. It had taken a defensive instead of an offensive place in the propagation of the new Faith, itself now requiring substantiation from the records of the past. In several passages these writers report what they understand to have been the teaching of Jesus about his return or what an apostle had said about it, aiming thus to throw light on a question that was puzzling to the Christians of their time. But it is significant that the latest of these writings, Luke and Acts, give much less attention to the subject than do the earlier ones (see Mark 13; Matt. 24-25; Luke 12:35-48; Acts 1:6-8, 10-11; 2:16-22; 3:20-21).

A third factor was an increasing recognition of what we may call the *regulative* value of the past. At the beginning little need of regulation was felt. The new Faith, like other great movements, was carried along at first by the enthusiastic zeal of its adherents, which was a law unto itself. But inevitably this enthusiasm flagged or, what might be worse, took perverse directions and had to be restrained. In Paul's time the view still prevailed that any Christian might utter "prophecies" or "tongues," or in some other way—the Spirit speaking through him—contribute to the instruction or edification of his brethren. But the result was not always satisfactory. In 1 Corinthians Paul closes a lengthy discussion of the subject with the reminder that "God is a God not of disorder but of harmony" (14:33). That harmony was highly desirable, and that it would not secure itself, became more and more evident—harmony not only in the conduct of worship but in the very conception of what Christianity was. Men who called themselves Christians were believing and acting in ways quite different. There was serious danger that the centrifugal forces would prove stronger than the centripetal, and that the new religion would dissolve and disappear. All this pointed to the need of regulation—of something to serve as a standard, a norm. Thus increasingly Christians turned from the confused present to what seemed the glorious past, feeling that there was to be found that which would insure unity and stability. Theophilus, to whom Luke dedicated his work, had already been "instructed" in the Christian religion, but through this narrative Luke hoped he and others like him would learn the "certainty," the "*solid truth*," as to what this religion was and required (Luke 1:1-4).

Such, in general, was the situation which these writers sought to meet. Our information as to their background is not as full or definite as we could wish. Later Chris-

tian writers—Papias, Justin, Irenaeus, and others—have a little to tell us, but it is at best scanty and not always reliable. We have to depend mainly on what we can gather from the writings themselves, and this requires critical study of a particularly painstaking and difficult sort. Undoubtedly writings produced with a practical purpose in view, as these were, will reflect at many points the situation which called them forth; and, conversely, this situation once grasped, the reader has a key to the better understanding of what is before him on the page. A modern writer of history may be expected to state his facts more or less objectively. If he wishes to make the facts a basis for edification or inspiration he will presumably make it clear where the statement of fact ends and the lessons drawn from it begins. But no such standard prevailed in ancient times. It did not prevail in the writing of these books. Critical study has done much, and has yet much to do, to make a full understanding of them possible. Only as such studies attract competent minds, and proceed with the aid of the best knowledge and equipment of our age, will the history of Christianity's beginnings be clear to us. Fortunately, the religious and ethical values of these books are more readily appropriated. They can make God real and near to us, and point out to us the way of duty and of brotherhood without our requiring the scholar's aid. Yet even here scholarship is far from valueless. It reveals treasures that otherwise would not be found, and it gives "a sense of what is vital" (Phil. 1:10).

B. The Gospel According to Mark.

The earliest of the Gospels is the second, not the first, of those which stand in our New Testament. It seems to have been written by a Jew named John, who was also known by the Roman name Marcus, or Mark. The Gospel itself does not tell us that he wrote it. We get the

information from early Christian tradition outside the New Testament, which we have reason to think is reliable. None of the books in this group has any direct evidence within itself as to who wrote it. (The titles which we know are of later origin and merely reflect opinion within the early church as to who the authors were.) In this they are sharply distinguished from the first group, in which each "book" explicitly presents itself as the work of Paul.

But to return to John Mark. He was Paul's companion for a time on his missionary journeyings, and in this connection is referred to several times in the New Testament (see Acts 12:25; 13:5, 13; 15:37-39; Col. 4:10; etc.). His childhood home had been in Jerusalem, where he belonged to a prominent Christian family (see Acts 12:12). It would seem likely that in after years he would remember something of the fateful events in his native city at the time of Jesus' trial and death, but he may have been very young at this time. A number of Christian writers of the second century agree that Mark's Gospel embodies Peter's reminiscences about Jesus, and this may have a basis in fact. What we gather from these references is that toward the close of Peter's life Mark was with him at Rome, serving as his secretary—perhaps interpreter—and that having heard the apostle say much about Jesus Mark afterward wrote down what he could recall. His Gospel would thus be made up largely of such incidents about Jesus as Peter had found most impressive and convincing to his hearers in a great Gentile city like Rome.

On the whole the characteristic traits of this Gospel may be said to support the tradition as to its origin. One of the most noticeable of these traits is the sketchy, disconnected character of the narrative. As a rule there is little to suggest that the order in which the incidents are related is the order in which they occurred. "And it

came to pass that he was sitting at meat in his house . . ."; "And again he began to teach by the sea side . . ."; "And he entered again into the synagogue . . ."; "And he cometh into a house . . ."; these introductory sentences are typical. They give the impression that the author had got the incidents from a source which told him very little as to just when each occurred, or what their relation was to other incidents. And this of course would be the case if he got them from the lips of a preacher, whose concern would be with the impression to be made on his audience, not with chronology. Yet Mark's Gospel does have order and sequence in its main outline, though not in detail. From some source or other Mark had secured information as to the general course which Jesus' brief public life had taken. It had begun with his baptism at the hands of the desert prophet John the Baptizer. Following this Jesus himself had spent some time in desert solitude. He then returned to his home district of Galilee and began a ministry of preaching, teaching, and mighty works, going about from place to place. This was followed by a period of retirement with his disciples in Phoenician territory to the north, some further activities in the neighborhood of the Sea of Galilee, a second journey northward upon which occurred the important incidents of the transfiguration and Peter's confession of Jesus' Messiahship, a long southward journey with Jerusalem as the goal, and finally the tragic last week in the capital, with its happy sequel in the news that Jesus, though he had died, was alive. This was what Mark understood to have been the general course of Jesus' public life. As to whether he had been informed on this point by Peter we cannot say. In any case it is the earliest testimony on the subject that we have, and may be trusted as substantially correct. The Fourth Gospel, as we shall see, has a quite different outline.

Another characteristic of Mark, as compared with later Gospels, is a frankness in referring to human traits of Jesus and to weaknesses of his disciples. He does not shun to say that Jesus was angry at times, and that he refused to be called "Good Master" on the ground that only God is good. He refers to him as a "carpenter," not merely a "carpenter's son," speaks of him as having been "driven" by the Spirit into the desert, not merely "led"; and relates that on one occasion members of his family tried to put a stop to his activities, believing him to be insane. In like manner the disciples' dullness of understanding is referred to repeatedly. They did not understand Jesus when he told them that he was to die and rise again. Here Luke inserts the explanation that "it was concealed from them," but Mark states it without apology, adding that "they were afraid to ask him." They did not understand the parables, or what Jesus meant when he bade them beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, or the significance of what had happened when the multitude was fed. They argued about who should be greatest in the coming Kingdom in a way that was human enough but not dignified. It is interesting to note how in Matthew and Luke, though Mark was used as the source (see below), these references have been softened down. Thus early was the tendency manifested for later conceptions to get in the way of the simple facts of history—conceptions due to reverence, to the practical needs of the later day, or to some other cause. No doubt even in Mark this tendency has operated to some extent; but relatively, at least, it is free from it, and we have reason to be thankful that this early sketchbook of the acts of Jesus has been preserved for us. Its sketches are vivid and lifelike, whether or not Peter is mainly responsible for them. (See Mark 3:4-5; cf. Matt. 12:12-13 and Luke 6:9-10; Mark 10:14; cf. Matt. 19:14 and Luke 18:16; Mark 10:18; cf. Matt. 19:17 and Luke

18:19; Mark 6:3; cf. Matt. 13:55 and Luke 4:22; Mark 1:12; cf. Matt. 4:1 and Luke 4:1; Mark 3:21—no parallels; Mark 4:13; cf. Matt. 13:18 and Luke 8:11; Mark 8:16-21; cf. Matt. 16:7-12; Mark 9:32; cf. Matt. 17:23 and Luke 9:45; Mark 9:34; cf. Matt. 18:1 and Luke 9:46.)

Yet after all the touches in Mark's narrative which bring out the humanness of Jesus are incidental and casual. They are there not because Mark wished to emphasize them but because they were a part of the material when he got it, and it did not seem needful to him—as it did to his successors—that they should be toned down. What Mark did wish to make loom large was the greatness of Jesus. The wonder of his teachings (though Mark tells us little as to what he taught), his power over disease and the forces of nature, the way in which spirits of evil acknowledged his supremacy and showed their fear of him, his calm superiority over his enemies even when in their power, his triumphant return from the grave: these are the oustanding things. When we see Jesus through Mark's eyes we see him as a sovereign and majestic figure, a prophet but much more than a prophet, God's anointed Son. No doubt it was thus that Peter had presented him in his preaching. Certainly Paul, in his prison letters, had exalted him to an even greater height than does Mark. Thus did Christians, as far back as we can trace, ascribe to their Master a unique greatness, placing him in the highest category of which they knew.

C. The Gospel According to Matthew.

This Gospel is a revised and enlarged edition of Mark. The author has taken over nearly all the material of the earlier Gospel, and the order in which he presents it is much the same. The language also shows dependence on Mark, though it differs more or less throughout and in

some passages has been very considerably recast. Just how close the resemblance is can best be seen in a "Harmony" of the Gospels in which the corresponding sections are placed side by side.

Matthew, however, is a much larger Gospel than Mark. It is more than one and a half times as large, and this notwithstanding the fact that in adapting the Markan material to his use the author has often abbreviated it. This suggests that Mark cannot have been his only source —a surmise which is borne out by a closer examination of his book. We find that a small amount of matter having to do with what Jesus did, and a great deal having to do with what he said, are different from anything which we have in Mark. Some of this non-Markan matter, as we shall see a little later, was also used by Luke.

Where did the writer of this Gospel get this extra material? This question suggests another: Is this really a Gospel according to Matthew, and if so in what sense? If one of the Twelve wrote it he would naturally have a great deal of material of his own. But the mere fact that its main outline and the bulk of its material have been taken over from another man's work is enough to make it seem very doubtful whether one of those most closely associated with Jesus in his lifetime can have written it. We would have expected that a writer with such unique knowledge would have told the story more independently, and weight is added to this opinion by other considerations of a more technical sort. What may be the true answer to the second of our two questions— and a partial answer to the first—is suggested by a remark of Papias which has come down to us. Papias, who was a Christian bishop and writer of the early part of the second century, tells us that the apostle Matthew composed a book of "Logia." The most natural meaning of this word is *sayings,* which at once calls to mind the large amount of non-Markan material in our Matthew

which is of this character. There is fair reason for believing that one of the sources used in the writing of this Gospel was such a book as that of which Papias speaks. The title "According to Matthew" presumably would at first be applied only to the collection of sayings, being later transferred to the larger volume of which the sayings had become a part. As to just what, and how much, of the non-Markan matter in Matthew came from this Logia source it is impossible to say. It is fairly certain that some of the material in the Gospel did not come from either Mark or the Logia. The author (perhaps we should call him a compiler or editor) would have special information, whether in writing or received by word of mouth, which he would use as he saw fit to supplement the larger sources on which he mainly depended.

More plan and system have gone into the making of Matthew than of Mark. The one systematic feature of Mark—the general outline of Jesus' public life—is taken over by Matthew with little change; while the additional discourse matter is mainly massed in five sections of the book. The most important of these is the Sermon on the Mount (Chapters 5-7). The others are to be found in Chapters 10, 13, 18, 23-25. In these chapters sayings of Jesus are presented in the form of extensive discourses, reminding the reader somewhat of the speeches of Moses in Deuteronomy. It is possible that the author of Matthew himself had this analogy in mind, and thought of his task—or an important part of it—as being to set forth Christianity's new and better Law.

But if it is a new "Law" it is also old. What this writer wants his readers to see is that Christianity is not an upstart among religions: it is the ancient religion of Moses and the prophets now universalized. Naturally he makes a great deal of use of the Hebrew Scriptures (the Old Testament) in developing this point, so much,

indeed, that the large amount of Old Testament matter in Matthew is one of its most noticeable characteristics. The author's way of using it is likely to seem to the modern reader mechanical and unconvincing, in some cases at least. It was in line with the best practice of his time, but our outlook is different. Yet if his way of bringing out his point does not greatly impress us the point itself has been both verified and emphasized by the lapse of time. This writer saw that through the mission of Jesus that which was best in Judaism was destined to become a world possession, and we of a distant century are in a position to see how clear his vision was.

It does not necessarily follow from the thoroughly Jewish background of this Gospel that its author's special aim was to convert Jews. If this was his aim he was not very tactful, since he emphasizes matter in which the most respected and popular class of Jewish leaders, the scribes and Pharisees, are severely criticized. More probably his purpose was to exalt Jesus and the church in the eyes of both Gentile and Jewish readers—Jesus as the anciently proclaimed Messianic King, and the church as now God's Chosen People, the Jews having proved unworthy of their call. And he was successful. His book became very popular among Gentile Christians, who found in it just such material as was needed both for their own guidance and for presenting the claims of their religion to those who had not yet accepted it. Mark, for a time, was almost eclipsed.

Renan considered Matthew "the most important book that has ever been written." The fact that it includes the Sermon on the Mount would in itself go far toward justifying this estimate. For the modern student it is the most important source for the study of Jesus' ideas and ideals, as Mark is for the study of the outward facts of his public life.

D. The Two-Volume Work of Luke.

In Luke-Acts we have a work on the life of Jesus and the spread of Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome. It is in two parts, which occupy different positions in our New Testament, but the original connection between them is clearly seen when we compare the two prefaces (Luke 1:1-4; Acts 1:1-5). Both are dedicated to the same "Theophilus," and the "former treatise" is expressly referred to in the preface to Acts. The early church believed that the author was Paul's friend Luke, the "beloved physician" to whom he refers in Col. 4:14. We cannot prove this to be correct, but it is hard to imagine why Luke's name (otherwise little known) would have become connected with the work unless he really had something to do with its origin.

The first part, the Gospel, is like Matthew in that Mark serves as the framework while much supplementary matter—especially discourse matter—is used. Some of this supplementary matter is the same as Matthew's (with more or less variation in language); some of it is different. There is a lengthy section of independent material extending from 9:51 to 18:14. It is made up of teachings of Jesus, in parables and otherwise, with a meager framework of narrative. At the beginning (1:5-2:52) is a shorter section peculiar to this Gospel, containing narratives connected with Jesus' infancy and childhood, interspersed with poetic fragments much resembling psalms of the Old Testament. There are other bits of independent matter here and there. The total bulk of Luke is a little greater than that of Matthew.

This writer has an interesting and important word to say about *how*, as well as why, he went about his work. It is in the preface to the Gospel, already referred to (1:1-4). From it we gather that a Gospel such as Luke's (or Matthew) represents what may be called a fourth

stage in the handing down of the Christian tradition about what the Founder of the faith had done and said. In the first place, those "who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word" handed down their recollections to the younger generation by word of mouth. Second, among Christians of this new generation were "many" who undertook to "draw up a narrative" from materials thus received. These written accounts would at first be brief and fragmentary, but in time a work as extensive as our Mark was produced. This marks the third stage. Finally, Luke tells us, he himself made use of the work of his predecessors in producing a still more ambitious book—one which would more fully and satisfactorily inform the believer or inquirer as to the "solid truth" about Christianity. The writer of Matthew had already undertaken a somewhat similar task, but Luke probably did not know of this.

Luke, as compared with Matthew, is written not only for Gentiles but also by a Gentile from the Gentile point of view. He too sees Christianity as a universalized continuation of the ancient religion of the Hebrews, but he does not have particular interest in pointing out how the Jews had rejected the true faith. He is not a controversialist, as the author of Matthew is. On the contrary he is by nature kindly and sympathetic, and loves to picture Jesus as the friend of sinners and the poor.

This Gospel no doubt was written in and for different communities from those in which Matthew was at first known and used. For some time they would not cross each other's paths, and when later they came into competition neither was obliged to give way. Notwithstanding their similarity each had individual character and independent worth, and both were retained. Luke was superior from the point of view of literary excellence, and this may have helped it to retain its place. But its real title to immortality, as a part of the Christian

Scriptures, rests less upon literary merit than upon the value of the material which it alone has preserved. In the section 9:51-18:14 (not paralleled in any other Gospel) we have the parables of the Good Samaritan, the Rich Fool, the Lost Coin, the Prodigal Son, the Unjust Steward, the Rich Man and Lazarus, the Pharisee and the Publican; the incidents of the Ten Lepers, the Visit to Mary and Martha, the Woman Healed on a Sabbath, etc. The list is by no means complete, but it will suffice to illustrate the debt we owe to Luke for having preserved such materials.

In his second volume, Acts, Luke carries the narrative of "those matters which have been fulfilled among us" farther than any of the other Gospel writers carry it. Taking up the thread at the point where Jesus was "received up," after the resurrection appearances (the point at which the Gospel had come to a close) he proceeds to relate how in subsequent years, under the Spirit's guidance, the new-old religion which had Jesus as its center spread triumphantly from Jerusalem to Rome.

In the first part of this second book we read of early events in Jerusalem and elsewhere in Palestine. A number of Christian leaders figure in the story, Peter being the most prominent. But with Chapter 13 Paul becomes the chief actor, his conversion having been narrated in Chapter 9. From this point to the end of the book Paul and his mission to the Gentiles are the sole theme. The author follows the great missionary's journeyings from city to city in Syria, Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece, bringing him finally to Jerusalem, and thence, a prisoner, to Caesarea and Rome. Here Acts provides a historical framework for Paul's letters, as we have seen.

In this latter part of the book occur a number of so-called "we" passages, the author using the first person

plural as if he himself had been with Paul (16:10-18; 20:5-16; 21:1-16; 27:1-28:15). It would thus appear that he got his information as to Paul's movements largely at first hand, which gives to this part of his work exceptional value as a historical source. For the first, more miscellaneous part he no doubt had gathered data, as in the case of the Gospel, from whatever sources it could be obtained. It is noteworthy that he represents himself as having been with Paul on the last fateful journey to Jerusalem. We can scarcely doubt that he would take advantage of this opportunity of talking with those who could inform him about the stirring events of the early days, and it may be that some written as well as oral testimony would be available. But at this time some thirty years had already passed since the events of Pentecost and after, while another thirty years more or less were to go by before Luke would put out his history. Hence it is not surprising that from the point of view of historical accuracy his narrative of this early period in Palestine makes a less favorable impression than his accounts of the journeys of Paul. Yet as a source of religious stimulus and inspiration these stories of Christian beginnings have a record of usefulness which few parts of Scripture can surpass, and even to the historian their value is great. Without them our knowledge of how Christianity made the transition from a Jewish sect to a world religion would be much more meager than it is.

As to Luke's outlook as a writer of history a further remark or two should be made. Needless to say, his standards were those of the first century, not of the twentieth. For example, he was more credulous in the matter of the supernatural than a modern historian would be. That is to say that when he saw the hand of God clearly manifested in something that had occurred he was likely to assume that the divine action had been

direct and miraculous. The same incident, viewed by a modern student of history, would perhaps appear to be in harmony with God's ordinary ways of revealing himself in nature and in human events, though not the less great or significant for that. It is simply a difference in point of view. Again, we may judge that Luke's peace-loving temperament, together with his sense of the wonderful way in which God had launched and led the infant church, caused him to see the course of events as somewhat more smooth-flowing and harmonious than it actually was. At any rate such is the impression which we get from comparing his statements at some points, with Paul's. Where Paul was directly in touch with the events described, while Luke was not, the testimony of Paul must be taken as having the greater weight. On the other hand, Luke's references to the geography and administration of the Roman Empire in the time of which he writes have been shown by modern research to be so accurate as to cast favorable light upon his historical trustworthiness.

Neither Luke nor his writings stand in need of defense or apology. Their place as historical and religious classics has long since been won and will never be lost. What is needed is that they be read and understood in the light of the age and circumstances which called them forth. Only thus can they contribute in the best way to the needs of our age.

E. Conclusion.

What has just been said about Luke's books will apply, with little adaptation, to the others of the group as well. These writings are less *incidental,* less *occasional,* in origin than the Pauline group. They are "books" in a sense in which Paul's letters are not. Yet the difference is not as great as might be assumed. Paul did not set himself to write a complete and enduring system of theology. This fact is now tardily recognized. And no more did the

writers of the Gospels and Acts set themselves to write historical treatises after the manner of the scientific twentieth century. This also we need to learn. They wrote for their time, and after the manner of their time. The value of their work would have been less, not greater, had it been otherwise. But if it is to have its highest usefulness for us, whether in respect to history or religion, it must be handled, honestly and thoroughly, after the manner of our time.

CHAPTER VI

FURTHER WRITINGS IN RESPONSE TO FURTHER NEEDS

A. Messages For the Suffering (1 Peter, Hebrews, Revelation).

We meet with persecution in the Gospels and in Acts —the persecution of Jesus and his early followers by the leaders of the Jews. We meet with it also in Paul's letters—the persecution of Paul by Jewish enemies. But before the first century had come to a close the new religion was destined to meet with opposition from a non-Jewish and more powerful source. From time to time its enemies succeeded in arraying against it the all-dominating Roman government. There was a wave of persecution under Nero (54-68 A. D.), a second wave under Domitian (81-96), and a third under Trajan (98-117). The three New Testament books of this third group all bear unmistakable traces of having been called forth by the stress which such outbreaks of hostility produced. Even a hasty reading of them will show that this is true. Which of the several persecutions called them forth is less certain, but on the whole it seems most probable that it is the situation in Domitian's time which each reflects.

The author of 1 Peter is one of those who have not given up the hope of an early "revelation of Jesus Christ" On the contrary he believes that this great deliverance (1:7) which will result in the enemies of Christians being confounded and all that is now wrong being made right. On the contrary he believes that this great deliverance is at hand. The ancient prophets saw in advance not

only the sufferings of Christ but also glorious events which would follow; and these glorious events—the writer assures his readers—you yourselves are soon to experience (1:10-12). But this is not all; it is only the beginning of what he has to say. If you are to participate in this salvation which is prepared for you your lives must be pure, your conduct worthy of Christ. This exhortation he develops in detail, and it is upon it that he lays chief stress. That Christ's followers should be persecuted is not to be thought a thing incredible; they should rather glory at being partakers of his sufferings. Their attitude toward the government and officials who persecute them is not to be one of revolt but of submission. Thus their conduct under trial, as well as the purity and uprightness of their daily lives, will bear testimony to those about them of the reality and power of their faith. Such is the response to hostile pressure which one Christian writer advocates. (See 4:12-19; 3:13-18; 2:11-17; etc.)

In the case of Hebrews the fact that the background is one of persecution is less quickly evident. In the opening chapters the dominant thought is the greatness of Christ, particularly the supreme and perfect priesthood which God has established in him. But when we come to the tenth and following chapters we see that the writer has a definite and practical reason for this stressing of what might seem to be a rather abstract phase of Christian theology. In the early days of their faith his correspondents suffered bitter persecution and conducted themselves splendidly (10:32-34; probably the persecution under Nero). Now another attack is upon them, or is imminent, and there is danger that they will not acquit themselves so well. The early leaders have died (13:7), and the generation that has followed them lacks their keen sense of how great a thing it is to be a follower of Christ. The writer would supply this lacking knowledge and inspiration, lest they weaken under

trial and perhaps deny their glorious faith (see 2:1-3; 3:12-14; 4:14; 10:23, 35-39; 12:18-29; etc.). Here too the hope of Christ's return is held out (10:25, 36-37) and the importance of right conduct is urged (13:1-5, 16-17), but neither of these notes is prominent. To make these people feel how great a thing it is to be a Christian, and so keep them strong and true amid trials, this is the author's aim. From a literary point of view it is without doubt the most ambitious book in the New Testament. Even in translation—and in spite of reasoning which is likely to seem mechanical to the modern reader, and Scripture interpretation which he does not find convincing—the work has an impressive sweep. The appeal toward the close to the "cloud of witnesses" in Israel's history (Chapter 11) has been and still is one of the much-used parts of the Scriptures.

In Revelation we have yet another attempt to deal with a situation in which persecution is the outstanding fact. This writer, we gather, himself belongs to one of the suffering communities of Christians, but has been banished from it to the island of Patmos on account of his activities as a Christian leader (1:9). While thus in exile he writes his book, beginning it with specific messages to churches among which he intends it to circulate (Chapters 2-3). It is a very different book from the other two. It is not mainly Christological, though the greatness of Christ is set forth frequently. And it is not mainly ethical, though here and there the author shows that he is far from regarding right and wrong in the daily lives of Christians as matters of indifference. The dominant note is eschatological—the speedy coming of the end. This hope, as we have seen, was becoming less vivid as the decades passed. Use was still made of it in urging Chritians to be faithful in belief and in life—otherwise they might find themselves barred from citizenship in the Lord's Kingdom when he returned—but it

was not made the central thing. The case of this writer is altogether different. The horrors through which he has passed, and his sense of the injustice of it all, have raised questions in his mind for which conventional answers will not suffice. What he gives to his readers is that, and that only, which he has found will satisfy his own soul—not an elaborated theology, and not admonitions to be steadfast and do right, but a burning conviction that God has not forgotten and that because he has not forgotten vengeance upon their enemies and the glorious triumph of Christ and his followers are near at hand. (See 1:1-3, 7; 6:9-11; 11:15-18; 12:10-12; 14:6-7, 9-13; 16:4-7; 18:20; 19:2, 6-8; 20:4-6; 21:4; 22:6-7, 10.)

Under Domitian, for the first time, the attempt was seriously made to compel Christians, along with other subjects, to take part in the worship of the emperor. Probably it was this demand in particular that inspired this writer's passionate outburst against Rome. His attitude toward the mighty ruling power is in striking contrast with that of Paul and Luke and the author of 1 Peter. The latter are friendly, or at least conciliatory; he is rebellious and vengeful to the last degree. He exhausts his power of invective upon "Babylon the Great, the mother of the harlots and of the abominations of the earth," sitting upon her seven hills (17:4-5, 9). Her downfall and desolation, seen in vision, he celebrates in a paean of triumph which forms one of the great passages of the book (Chapter 18).

Perhaps it was partly from motives of caution that he chose to put his message in the form of an "apocalypse"—a type of prophetic utterance which had been in use by Jews for several centuries and more recently had been employed by Christians as well, but which to a Roman official who might chance to read it would be likely to seem strange and meaningless. To the average

modern reader also it appears strange and meaningless until the key to its understanding is put in his hands. The background, briefly sketched here, is the key. To have it does not mean that everything in the book will at once be clear; yet upon applying it one discovers that obscurities clarify themselves surprisingly, so that the general purport of the work is no longer a mystery.

We have no certain knowledge as to who wrote any one of these books. The first of the three is put forth as a work of the Apostle Peter's (1:1). Whether it really is so or whether the use of Peter's name is merely a literary device (as was common in New Testament times) we cannot say. There is no decisive evidence either way. It is very unlikely, however, that Peter was living at as late a date as the persecution under Domitian, so that if the epistle is really a product of this persecution Peter can scarcely have written it. Hebrews gives us no suggestion as to its author. Various names have been connected with it, both in ancient and in modern times, the most prominent being Paul's. But there are a number of reasons why Paul, almost certainly, cannot have been its author. The question of who wrote it is unanswerable and of little importance. The author of Revelation names himself as John (1:1, 4, 9; 22:8), but not as any particular John. There is no good reason for doubting that this was his name, nor is there any sufficient reason for assuming that he was the Apostle John, as is often done. No doubt the original readers knew very well what John he was, but we do not.

It is interesting to speculate as to whether there was any connection, in origin, between these three books. There may have been none, even though they were called forth by the same general situation and written at somewhere near the same time. Yet there are one or two possible points of contact. Hebrews seems probably to have been written to Rome, and 1 Peter from Rome (see

Heb. 13:24; 1 Pet. 5:13). May 1 Peter then have been written by a leader of the Roman church who thus accepted the challenge of Hebrews that the Roman Christians "ought to be teachers" of their brethren elsewhere (Heb. 5:12)? Again, both Revelation and 1 Peter had as their original readers persecuted Christians of Asia Minor (see Rev. 1:4, 11; 1 Peter 1:1). One is rebellious, the other conciliatory, toward the Roman government. May we conjecture that the occasion which seemed to the leader in the Roman church to justify an exercise of his "teaching" function for the guidance of other churches was none other than the appearance and circulation of what seemed to him an unduly inflammatory tract—of Revelation, in other words?

Whatever their original relationship, such are the "persecution books" of the New Testament—not its noblest literature, perhaps, yet worthy of the place which they occupy. They show us different reactions to suffering—to circumstances of stress and trial. And we are likely to feel that in some points the reactions reflect something less worthy, less timeless, than the true spirit of Christianity. But one thing at least which they tell us we shall do well to heed: that the Christian's answer to trouble is not to let his moral fiber weaken, to lose his grip on his religion as an energizing and inspiring force, or to yield his conviction that God is at the helm. His answer is the opposite of all this.

B. Exhortations on Congressional Doctrine and Discipline—for a Generation Later Than Paul's.

(a) *Pauline Fragments Amplified* (2 Timothy, Titus, 1 Timothy). The origin of these "Pastoral Epistles" has been, and remains, somewhat of a puzzle. They present themselves, in their opening salutations and elsewhere, as having been written by Paul to certain lieutenants of

his, Timothy and Titus by name. Of course this in itself would not be conclusive. It was a common practice, which we have already met with, for writers of the time to impersonate great figures of the past. But upon reading these epistles we find matter in them, here and there, which seems to have a personal touch so natural and spontaneous that we doubt if an impersonator can have written it. The references to "the cloak that I left at Troas . . . and the books," and to Alexander the coppersmith who "did me much evil," read like matter from a real letter. They also read like a letter of Paul's (see 2 Tim. 4:13-14).

On the other hand, the general situation which these writings reflect, and the point of view from which they are written, seem other and later than Paul's. This is shown in particular by the frequency with which "sound doctrine," and similar phrases, come from the author's pen. What he thus harps upon is not, in his mind, an abstract thing detached from the realities of life. On the contrary the value that he sees in it is highly practical. He sets it over against empty speculations that in practice yield immorality. He is not a doctrinaire theologian, but has his feet on solid ground. All this is to be recognized and set to his credit. But his position, none the less, is characteristic of a later rather than an earlier—a post-Pauline rather than a Pauline—stage of the church's development. It points to a time when the discovery has been made that Christian individuals and communities require for their guidance something more than the spontaneous working of the Spirit if dissolution is to be avoided, morality guarded, and progress made safe and sane. It is true, of course, that Paul himself was continually making this discovery as he journeyed among the churches. Yet it is hard to believe that he was ever led to place the emphasis on set forms of teaching and on discipline, as this writer places it. His way of securing

"good works" was different, more religious, more mystical. If we find Paul at the point where "sound words" loom larger in his thought than the life of the soul with God in Christ, then we can only say that we scarcely recognize him as Paul. (See 2 Tim. 1:13-14; 4:1-5; Titus 1:7-11; 2:1-10; 1 Tim. 1:3-11; 4:1-6; 6:1-5.)

There is a good deal of additional evidence, pro and con, but it is largely technical, and we need not present it here. The solution of the enigma which has most commended itself is that in these epistles we have genuine fragments of Paul's correspondence which a later writer has amplified, using them as nuclei—"texts," so to speak—for practical discussions and exhortations of his own. Presumably he was an admirer of the great apostle and thought thus to bring the force of his mind and spirit to bear on the situation of this later day.

1 Timothy is the longest and most formal of the three. It is addressed to one who is assumed to have general charge of a number of Christian congregations in some unnamed locality in the Gentile world, the intention being that use should be made of its rather detailed injunctions for the proper ordering of local churches and the guidance of their officers in the path of orthodoxy and morality. There is very little personal allusion in it, and it probably has the smallest nucleus of original Pauline matter of any of the three. This suggests that it was perhaps the latest to be written, though we can have no certainty as to that.

2 Timothy reveals the personal touch at several points and so may be thought to stand nearer to Paul (see 1:5-6, 15-18; 4:9-21). But when we come to what the writer must have regarded as the heart of his message (3:1-4:5), the hand of the impersonator of Paul rather than of Paul himself is apparent. He employs the familiar device of picturing a present situation in the lan-

guage of prediction: "In the last days grievous times shall come" (3:1), but as we read on we see that the grievous times have already come, times of doctrinal and moral apostasy. They are projected into the future that Paul, to whom they were future, may be heard with regard to them. The author feels that he knows what Paul would have said, so he speaks in the apostle's name (cf. 1 Tim. 4:1ff.).

Titus has some personal references at the beginning and end, while the body of the short epistle is made up of injunctions regarding church officers and different classes of church members, following lines similar to those met with in 1 and 2 Timothy.

From the point of view of religious depth and passion, or as revealing a powerful and magnetic personality, these three epistles suffer by comparison with almost any one of the ten in the recognized Pauline group. Only here and there do we seem to glimpse the mind and soul of the great missionary shining forth. Yet the writer of the "Pastorals" was not lacking in either ability or consecration. He lived at a time when the first flush of Christianity's youth was gone and it was seen that the stern facts of a workaday world must be reckoned with. And for dealing with practical situations of this character he had large capacity. Even apart from its connection with Paul his work was worthy, and has proved its worthiness, to survive.

(b) *Two Notes from the Elder John* (2 John, 3 John). The "elect lady" to whom 2 John is addressed is presumably a church. The writer is an "elder" who would seem to have held a supervisory position similar to that ascribed to Timothy and Titus in the epistles which bear their names. False teachers are abroad, and the elder fears lest this church receive and be corrupted by them. They deny that "Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh," seem-

ingly holding views akin to those of the Docetists of later church history. And the doctrinal error has a bad effect on practical conduct. The elder feels it needful to remind these brethren that the old Christian principle of love for one another still holds; also that it is not an abstraction, but involves walking according to the commandments of God.

3 John seems to have been intended for a prominent member of the church to which 2 John is addressed. His name is Gaius. He is friendly to the elder, while we learn of another prominent man in the church, Diotrephes, who takes a hostile attitude. When traveling missionaries visit his church—sent by the elder or with his approval—their reception is uncertain. In the past Gaius has received and entertained them with all cordiality, whereas Diotrephes not only has not welcomed them himself but has tried to secure the excommunication of those who have. Evidently the revolt in this church against the elder and those who stand with him is rather serious. He writes this note as an introduction to one of the traveling missionaries, Demetrius by name, who carries it with him to be presented to Gaius when he arrives. The writer takes occasion to express his appreciation of Gaius' support and his condemnation of Diotrephes, as well as to say a good word for Demetrius. No doubt Demetrius also carried with him the elder's note of warning to the church (2 John).

These notes are very brief, yet they throw interesting and needed light on the inner life of a more or less typical Christian community near the close of the first century. The Christian elder who writes them does not identify himself by name. We do not know who he was, but it is noteworthy that the language of these two notes has close affinities with that of the Fourth Gospel and the epistle known as 1 John, so close as to suggest a common authorship (see further below).

C. Additional Tracts for the Needs of This Later Time.

(a) *Religion for a Workaday World* (James). James is about the same length as 1 Timothy and resembles it further in that it deals with practical matters and handles them in an easily understandable way. The author of James, however, does not have the congregational unit so much in view. Even where he starts a line of discussion with a reference to the attitude of Christians toward a rich man and a poor man who may chance to attend one of their church services (2:2), the reference proves to be only a starting point. Here and elsewhere the writer has in view not merely the relation of the Christian to the congregation to which he belongs, but also, and more particularly, those aspects of his religion which should operate independently of congregational organization and discipline.

This tract is easy to read, but it is not easy to analyze. The writer does not develop his theme after the logical fashion which commends itself to us. Yet he has a theme, and it has "divisions," though they may not continue uninterruptedly or follow each other successively. His theme, we may say with sufficient accuracy, is "Religion for a Workaday World." (It is the Christian religion which he has in mind, but the fact is not made prominent.) He deals with religion in its relation to steadfastness (1:2-4, 6-8, 12-17; 5:7-11); to wisdom (1:5; 3:1, 13-18); to the old Law (2:10-13; 4:11-12; 5:12; cf. 1:25; 2:8); to practical materialism (1:9-11; 2:1-9; 4:1-10; 4:13-5:6); and to everyday morality (1:18-27; 2:14-26; 3:2-12; 5:13-18). It is the last two which receive most attention. To this writer the pragmatic test for religion is sufficient and final. Does it work? Does it secure right conduct in daily life? Christianity, where genuine, meets this test, and that is why he values it.

The name "James" stands in the opening salutation of this tract. The view has been widely held that it is the work of James the brother of Jesus, head of the church at Jerusalem, and that it is among the earliest written books of the New Testament. But this has been much doubted, in the early church as well as in modern times. Among present-day scholars the feeling widely prevails that its atmosphere is that of the opening of the second century rather than the middle of the first. Not only its strongly practical and moralistic emphasis but also its lack of interest in Jesus' resurrection and Messianic claims must be taken into account. The affinities which it thus reveals are with the Pastoral Epistles, and with *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (a Christian work of the second century) rather than with Paul and the authors of the early gospel narratives.

"Faith" to Paul was a spiritual dynamic. To be "in Christ" was the vital thing: good works would follow from having one's life thus anchored, whereas to give explicit and detailed attention to them, as Paul himself had done in earlier days, did not produce the desired result (see Rom. 7:14-8:11; 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 2:19-21; etc.). But undoubtedly there was danger that such doctrine imperfectly grasped by lesser souls would lend itself to a divorcing of religion from the duties of daily life. Very probably it was with the knowledge that such abuse had occurred, and with the desire to correct it, that the writer of James took his pen in hand. Paul's dominant interest had been in whence religion comes; his was in whither religion goes. The former is the more fundamental, the more truly religious, emphasis; but the latter is not to be scorned.

(b) *Polemics against Heretics* (Jude, 2 Peter). We have seen that as the first Christian century advanced lines of cleavage in Christian thought and practice more

and more appeared. Around the middle of the century Paul's great battle with the Judaizers (so vividly reflected in Galatians) was fought and won. One grave danger was now past—the danger that the new religion would define itself as a mechanical scheme, after Jewish models, for gaining acceptance with God. Later in the century, we gather, another threat loomed large. It came from an opposite source and was nearly opposite in character. The danger now was not that Christianity would concern itself overmuch with Jewish mechanics of salvation and minutiae of conduct, but rather that it would resolve itself into a speculative philosophy, taking over the "Gnostic" ideas so popular in the Gentile world of the time. This involved not only doing violence to the historical facts about the life and teachings of Jesus, and rejecting the generally accepted views as to his death, resurrection, and messiahship, but carried with it arrogance toward others and moral laxity as well. Those who took the Gnostic view of religion seem to have thought of themselves as forming a privileged inner circle, exalted above their brethren and possessing a "spirituality" which exempted them from rules of conduct applying to ordinary men. Such at any rate is the view of them which we get from one who, like the writer of Jude, was opposed to them, and we are able to check it up to some extent from less biased sources.

This Gnostic tendency, or something similar to it, is reflected in nearly all the later writings of the New Testament (those of the last three groups), but it is in Jude and 2 Peter that it is attacked most directly and vehemently. The writer of Jude does not argue with the errorists or try to refute them; he roundly condemns them and warns those to whom he writes that destruction lies that way. The religious value of his philippic is slight. It contains an often quoted phrase about "the faith which

was once for all delivered unto the saints" (verse 3), and has at the close an ascription of praise to God as Savior which is widely used in Christian worship.

2 Peter bears a relation to Jude somewhat similar to that of Ephesians to Colossians, or of Matthew and Luke to Mark. The larger work, 2 Peter, has been composed of matter from the smaller one, Jude. This matter has been handled freely and considerably amplified. The matter in 2 Peter not taken from Jude has to do mainly with the ever recurring question of the return of Christ. So much time has now elapsed, and the hope has so often been deferred, that some are scoffing at the idea that he will ever return. The notion that there will be a cataclysmic end of things is an idle dream. "From the day that the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were" (3:4)—and will so continue, the scoffers hold. But this writer vigorously combats such views. The time of waiting has really been short, as God counts time. For Him one day is as a thousand years. It has been out of mercy—consideration of their unpreparedness—that the end has been delayed. When he is least expected the Lord will come. Wherefore, "what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy living and godliness?" (3:11).

The identity of "Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ" (verse 1), we do not know. It is likely that the words, "and brother of James," which follow were inserted later by someone who thought that the writer was one of the family of Joseph and Mary referred to in Mark 6:3 (cf. Matt. 13:55). As to the authorship of 2 Peter the one point which may be regarded as certain is that the Apostle Peter did not write it. It is a product of a much later day. Paul's letters not only were known as a collection but had attained the status of Scripture, which assuredly did not happen until after Peter's time (see 3:15-16). 2 Peter is, in fact, a typical example of literary impersonation. The writer assumes the standpoint of Peter and

expresses what he probably believes would have been Peter's sentiments, but Peter has been dead perhaps half a century when he writes, and it is the perils and problems of a later day with which he deals. His tract is probably the latest composition in the New Testament. It is also very nearly the weakest from the standpoint of the intellectual and spiritual power that have gone into it.

D. A Ripened Christology (John, 1 John).

The tract known to us as 1 John shows affinities with most of the other New Testament writings of the later groups. It has in view Docetic and Gnostic heretics and heresies of the same general character as those combated in Jude, 2 Peter, and 2 John (see 2:18-23; 4:1-3; etc.). This writer is much concerned with the false attitudes and the laxity of morals which these doctrinal errors beget. So far from being sinless, as they claim, these errorists neither keep God's commandments nor love their brethren. They thus show themselves to be children of the devil, not of God—not followers of Christ but anti-Christs (see 1:5-10; 2:3-11; 3:1-12; 4:7-21; etc.). There is a passage condemning the materialistic outlook on life (2:15-17) and another showing the emptiness of religion when divorced from compassion for the needy (3:17-18), which are suggestive of James.

Thus 1 John might appropriately be grouped with the "Polemics against Heretics." There is as good or better reason, however, for grouping it with the Gospel which also bears the name of John. There is a difference, more striking than the resemblances, between 1 John and the other late epistles of the New Testament. Its ethical admonitions are bound up, at every point, with what the writer believes, and wishes his readers to believe, about Christ. And his view of Christ is substantially that which the Gospel presents. We shall

proceed to note briefly the outstanding characteristics of this view.

In the Fourth Gospel we have the development of a thesis rather than a sketch of a life. The thesis may be stated thus: That Jesus, the Christian Messiah, was and is a divine being in a unique sense, God's representative on earth for a time and himself one with God from eternity, the only Savior from sin and giver of eternal life (cf. 20:30-31). The development is not in logical order according to our ideas. A number of lines of evidence are offered, but if the reader wishes to have them before him in orderly array he must search them out and arrange them for himself. The following statement covers the main points:

(1) The identity of Jesus with the divine Word, through which (or whom) both Jewish and Greek thinkers had conceived of God as expressing Himself from eternity (1:1-18; cf. 1 John 1:1).

(2) Jesus' own consciousness, expressed in argument and discourse, that he was from God and was one with Him, and that therefore he and he only could give eternal life to men. "For the bread of God is that which cometh down out of heaven and giveth life unto the world. . . . I am the bread of life (6:33, 35)." This is the underlying idea in practically all the discourse matter which makes up a large proportion of the total bulk. It is the most distinctive feature of the book.

(3) Jesus' miracles, which were explicity intended by him as "signs" of his divinity. "This beginning of his signs did Jesus . . . and manifested his glory" (2:11); "No one can do these signs that thou doest except God be with him" (3:2); "Jesus answered, . . . The works that I do in my Father's name, these bear witness of me" (10:25). Such expressions are frequent and reveal clearly what the author understood to be the significance of Jesus' deeds of power.

(4) Scripture prophecies fulfilled in Jesus' life. "These are they which testify of me," says Jesus (5:39), and the author frequently points to specific instances of Scripture fulfillment in what Jesus did or said (see 2:17; 12:12-15, 37-40; 13:18; 19:24, 36-37).

(5) Explanation of facts about Jesus which might seem to contradict the claims made by and for him. His rejection by his own people was because God had "blinded their eyes" and "hardened their heart." Another reason was fear lest they should be "put out of the synagogue" (see 12:39-40, 42-43; cf. 6:64-65; 8:47; 10:26; etc.). About the stumbling block of the cross much is said. Jesus' death was essential to God's plan (18:11). He himself not only knew of it in advance but accepted it voluntarily (10:11, 15, 17-18; 15:13; 19:11). It was for him, indeed, the means of return to his position of glory with God (12:23-25; 13:3). Moreover, it was necessary in order that man might be drawn to him (12:32-33), and, in particular, that the sin of men might be removed (1:29; cf. 1 John 1:7; 2:2; 3:5). In such ways does this writer rebut the arguments of the enemies of Christianity against its Founder's claims.

And to the thesis, thus established, there are important corollaries. One is the necessity of *belief* in Christ, that his unique benefits may be secured (1:7, 12; 6:29, 47; 8:24; 1 John 3:23; 5:1, 5; etc.). Again, there should be vital *union* with Christ, that as he and the Father are one so his followers may be one with him. "Abide in me, and I in you" is one of the book's characteristic notes (6:56-57; 15:1-10; 1 John 2:24, 27, 28; 3:24; etc.). And not less essential is *obedience* to God's and Christ's commands. "If ye keep my commandments ye shall abide in my love, even as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love" (15: 10: cf. 8:51, 55; 14: 15, 21, 23-24; 17:6; 1 John 2:3-5; 3:22, 24; etc.). Similarly, there must be *love* among Christian brethren, as

God loves Christ and Christ loves his own (15:9-12; 17:26; 1 John 4:7; etc.). A fifth corollary is the *spiritual* character of Christianity. God himself is spirit, and a religion coming so directly from the divine source must partake of His nature in this respect. Entrance into His Kingdom, that is into eternal life, is through spiritual rebirth (3:3-8). The true worshipers of the Father are those who worship Him not only with set forms and in special localities but "in spirit and in truth" (4:23-24). When he returns to heaven, Christ promises, he will leave with his followers a spiritual presence—a Helper, Advocate, Friend—as his and God's representative (14:26; 15:26). So large did these conceptions loom in the author's thought that the expectation of a visible return of Christ to earth had ceased to have much reality for him. Once more, there follows from the thesis the *definite* character of Christianity. As Christ is incomparably nearer to God than any other, it follows that the religion which centers in Christ has a definiteness, a finality, which none other could possibly claim. The divine Word in human form, the writer declares, has dwelt among us; his glory has been seen by his followers (1:14; 1 John 1:1-3): thus close is our contact with the Father God of the universe. "We speak that which we know, and bear witness of that which we have seen" (3:11).

Such are the outstanding ideas of this Gospel. For the most part they are not new ideas in the sense of not being met with elsewhere in the New Testament. But as an *ensemble* of such ideas the book is unique. The reader is reminded, at one point and another, of one of the other Gospels, of Hebrews, of the later epistles, and in particular of Paul. It presents what may be called a ripened Christology—Christ as seen by a deeply religious and highly intellectual Christian living in the Gentile world, who is familiar with Greek thought as well as with Jewish and the earlier Christian literature, and

who feels that the needs of the time demand a new portrait of the great Founder of the Faith. He has been impressed by the lofty conceptions of Christ which have come from the pen of Paul, but he also feels keenly the danger that these conceptions, modified by the Gnostic tendencies of his time and locality, and confused by expectations of a visible Return, may lead farther and farther away from the historical Jesus and from the deep realities of the life of the Spirit which he and Christians like him experience.

The outline of the public life of Jesus which the Fourth Gospel presents is very different from that of the other three. It suggests a longer ministry and a centering of activities in Judaea rather than in Galilee. The view of the miracles is also different, and there are contrasts at other points. But by far the most significant peculiarity of this Gospel is its view of what was the burden of Jesus' teaching—what he mainly talked about. In the other Gospels the prevailing theme is the Kingdom of God, or of Heaven. The idea of such a realm was taken over from Jewish thought, and Jesus is represented as constantly using it as a means of picturing an ideal of life for individuals and society, urging his hearers, meanwhile, to prepare themselves by repentance for participation in such a brotherhood. As to himself and his personal relation to the realization of this ideal, he is reticent, avoiding any public claims on his own behalf and keeping even his immediate followers in considerable uncertainty. The view of the Fourth Gospel, as we have seen, is utterly different. Here Christ, not the Kingdom idea, is to the fore. A large part of the book is taken up with discourses of Jesus in which practically the sole theme is his unique relation to God, and in consequence his absolute significance for men.

The great difference, it should be noted, is not in the conception of Christ. The authors of Mark, Matthew,

and Luke have a view of him which is only a little less lofty than that of John. But they do not put this conception into Jesus' own mouth in such a way as to picture him constantly bearing witness to himself. Did he thus bear witness to himself? It is significant that the writer presents the discourses of Jesus and his own reflection about him in the same style, and that in at least one passage the two shade into each other so that the reader is in doubt as to which is which (see 3:10-21; cf. 3:27-36). It is hard to avoid the impression that the author, by a literary device common both in ancient and modern times, is making Jesus the mouthpiece of his own thoughts about him.

The tradition that the Apostle John wrote this Gospel can scarcely be correct. It is too late—has back of it too long a development of Christian thought and experience, differs too radically in its outline from the seemingly trustworthy outline of Mark, makes Jesus too much a propounder of Christian theology and too little a herald of the Kingdom of God, is too little concerned with the facts of his earthly life—to have had such origin. It is an anonymous work, written probably late in the first or early in the second century. There is some indication that it may have been produced in the neighborhood of Ephesus. 1 John must have either had the same author or proceeded from the same "school" of thought. (So also 2 and 3 John; see above.)

From the point of view of the early and medieval church Revelation, with its vivid pictures of a cataclysmic end of the present order and the ushering in of a new and better age, was a fitting book with which to close the New Testament. But to modern students of the Bible and observers of life the Fourth Gospel stands out as the real climax of Scripture—the last great embodiment of the thought of primitive Christianity. The author saw that previous portrayals of Jesus and pre-

sentations of the faith which centered in him were inadequate to meet the needs of changed conditions and environment. Christianity had now definitely severed its connection with Judaism and was as definitely planted in the Genile world. This meant that new problems had to be faced, new battles fought. Weapons for this warfare had been forged here and there, but they were not readily available. It was desirable that there should be a gathering together of ideas that had developed with the progress of Christianity, and in particular that these should be presented in relation to the fundamental fact of God's manifestation of Himself in Christ.

Such was the task which this great Christian writer undertook. In the mere fact of his undertaking it there are suggestion and inspiration for the church of our day. We also are faced with the necessity of readjustment and restatement, if the significance of our Master is to be realized and appropriated by the men and women of our age. And there is much of inspiration and guidance for us in the book itself. How great in their depth and simplicity are such sayings as these: "God is spirit, and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth"; "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come he shall guide you into all the truth"; "He that hath seen me (Jesus) hath seen the Father"; "Work not for the food which perisheth, but for the food which abideth unto eternal life"; "If any man willeth to do his will he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God!" There are intellectual presuppositions in this book which the world has outgrown, as God in His providence has led us on. But the real power of the book is not intellectual, and it has refused to die. It still "finds us," to use Coleridge's phrase.

CHAPTER VII

HOW MISCELLANEOUS CHRISTIAN WRITINGS CAME TO BE A "NEW TESTAMENT"

A. The Collection of Christian Writings in Groups.

The tendency of Christian writings to gravitate together probably manifested itself first in the case of the letters of Paul. We have seen that in several cases two or more letters had the same destination, so that to a limited extent they were grouped from the first. It is further to be noted that the interchange of letters, by different churches which had received them, would be relatively easy, since the Christian communities to which Paul wrote were located in five great centers of commerce and trade: 1 and 2 Thessalonians and Philippians to the prosperous seacoast region of Macedonia; 1 and 2 Corinthians to the commercial capital of Greece; Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon to a prosperous and flourishing district in the Roman province of Asia; Galatians to groups of believers who dwelt along one of the great inland trade routes of the Near East; Romans to the world's metropolis in Italy. These centers were connected by good roads and regular lines of ships, and communication was very extensive, notwithstanding the lack of such postal systems as the modern world enjoys. Even churches as distant from each other as those of Rome and Philippi would not find it difficult to exchange copies of Paul's letters, and so add to the number which each possessed.

Granting that there was the facility, would there be the

disposition? On one occasion, we may recall, Paul himself gave explicit directions on the subject: "And when this epistle hath been read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans, and that ye also read the epistle from Laodicea" (Col. 4:16). After Paul's death the collecting of his letters, by churches which looked to him as their spiritual father, would no doubt proceed apace. Analogous cases are numerous. The letters of John Hay, Henry Drummond, Theodore Roosevelt, Walter Hines Page, as modern examples; those of Cicero, Seneca, Ignatius, from the ancient Graeco-Roman world—these and many other collections illustrate the disposition to collect and treasure the letters of great men after they have passed away. Early in the second century Polycarp, head of the church of Smyrna, had occasion to write to the Christians at Philippi. The time was soon after Ignatius of Antioch, one of the outstanding Christian leaders of the period, had been taken to Rome for martyrdom. Near the close of his letter Polycarp writes thus: "The letters of Ignatius, which he wrote unto us, together with what others of his have come to our hands, we have sent to you according to your order . . . by which ye may be greatly profited." It is a safe conjecture that churches which were thus concerned to secure the letters of Ignatius already had collections of the letters of Paul. More direct evidence, pointing in the same direction, is to be had from 2 Peter: "Even as our beloved brother Paul also . . . wrote unto you, . . . as also in all his letters . . ." (3:15-16). This writer, of the first part of the second century, not only knows a considerable number of Paul's letters but assumes that they are familiar to his readers as well as himself. And the readers whom he has in view are not Christians of a single community, but "them that have obtained a like precious faith with us" (1:1).

While a collection of Paul's letters was thus taking

shape the "gospels" were also showing the grouping tendency. In our earliest manuscripts the single title "The Gospel" is applied to all four books together, only the words "according to Matthew," "according to Mark," etc., appearing as special headings. These manuscripts date from the fourth century, but the collective title for the Gospels can be traced back to a good deal earlier date than this. Yet each had a distinct origin, as we have seen, so that they cannot have been designated in this way at first. The joint title can have come into use only after the different Gospels had gravitated together and were known collectively. Expression was thus given to the judgment that these writings presented one and the same gospel from four different points of view. The gospel in this fourfold form seems to have been known early in the second century. It is possible that the four were first issued together by Christian leaders who were interested in commending John to the Christian communities. This Fourth Gospel had but recently been written, and being so different from those already in circulation it would have had a hard time winning its way as their rival, hence the idea of avoiding the appearance of rivalry by presenting the four as joint and supplementary witnesses.

Were the fact not so familiar to us it would be a matter of surprise that all four of these more or less parallel narratives survived. Probably the main reason was that each had gained so firm a footing in one or more communities that it could not readily be dislodged. In the interests of harmony it was better that all should be retained and given the sanction of church authority. There was also the fact that each bore a name that connected it directly or indirectly with the apostles, and the weight of those names was worth something to the church—that is, to the orthodox leaders—in their warfare against heresy.

At any rate all were retained, though their competitors in the field—of which there were several—were discarded and forgotten. When Tatian, about 175 A. D., undertook the task of compiling all the accepted narratives of the life of Jesus into one, he used our four Gospels and no others. His work was called the *Diatessaron,* meaning "through," or "with the use of, four." At not far from the same time Irenaeus, writing about the Gospels, declared that "as there are four quarters of the world in which we live, as there are also four universal winds, and as the church is scattered over all the earth, and the gospel is the pillar and base of the church and the breath of life, it is likely that it should have four pillars breathing immortality on every side and kindling afresh the life of men. Whence it is evident that the Word . . . gave to us the gospel in a fourfold shape, but held together by one spirit." In the latter part of the second century, then, the matter was definitely settled, so definitely that opinion must have been tending in that direction for a long while. Thus early had the four narratives of Jesus' life which have come down to us become known together and conceived as one.

Thus far we have taken no account of how these Christian writings, whether Gospels or epistles, came to be regarded as Scripture. We have been concerned merely to point out that there was a grouping tendency at work, which tendency culminated in the formation of two important groups. These groups served as nuclei for the "New Testament" which was to be.

B. The Transition to the Status of Scripture.

Christianity began as an offshoot of Judaism, and to the earliest Christians "Scripture" meant the sacred books of the Hebrews, known to us as the Old Testament. It meant this and nothing more. When the new religion found itself thrust out into the Gentile world it

carried this Scripture with it. Indeed the Bible of the Jews was widely known outside of Palestine before Christianity came on the scene. Nearly all, if not all, of the books of the New Testament were written for the benefit and use of Christian communities in Gentile lands, yet on almost every page these books bear witness to the fact that the sacred writings of the Jews were regarded as the Word of God. It is true that Jesus is represented as dealing freely with these writings, and that Paul refuses any longer to regard them as constituting a "Law" in the strict and literal Jewish sense, yet when one of the later writers of the New Testament declares that "all Scripture is inspired by God and profitable . . . to make the man of God proficient and equip him for good work of every kind," he expresses what was no doubt the general sentiment in orthodox Christian circles in his time (see 2 Tim. 3:16).

One of the most remarkable phenomena of early Christian history is the transition by which homely, almost casual, writings such as some of Paul's letters were had come, within a couple of generations after the writer's death, to be classed with the ancient Law and Prophets—to be spoken of by the sacred name "Scripture." We are to remember that as one of Paul's letters was read aloud to a group of Christians for whom it was originally intended, listening to it meant at most reverential attention to the words of a man; but when that same letter became Scripture its words sounded in the people's ears as the voice of God. How speedily the transition was made we learn from the New Testament itself. The passage in 2 Peter to which we have already referred bears witness not only to the fact that a collection of Paul's letters was known to the writer and his original readers, but also that these letters were classed with the "other Scriptures" (2 Pet. 3:16).

There is evidence to show that the Gospels came to be

held in the same regard at a date almost if not quite as early. In the so-called Epistle of Barnabas (Chapter 4) we find a quotation from Matthew introduced by the words, "as it is written," the phrase commonly applied to Old Testament quotations. This epistle seems to have been written about 120-130 A. D. Again, in 2 Clement, written about the middle of the second century, several quotations from Isaiah are followed by one from Matthew, the latter being introduced by the words, "And another Scripture sayeth" (2 Clement: 2). In the case of the other Gospels we do not have positive evidence until later, but since the four collectively were spoken of as "the gospel" all must have been regarded as Scripture when one was.

How is this rapid transition of Christian writings to the status of sacred Scriptures to be accounted for? In seeking an answer to this question we have to note that almost from the beginning Christians recognized two sources of divine authority in addition to the Jewish Scriptures, namely, Christ and the Spirit; while later a third source, the apostles, came to be held in high regard. The words of Jesus naturally were regarded as possessing the highest authority, and when the time came that those words were known as contained in books rather than handed down by word of mouth, it was inevitable that the sacred character originally ascribed to the words should come to be ascribed to the books which contained the words. Again, through the possession of the Spirit, the gift of prophecy was believed to be common in the primitive church. That is, one or more members of a Christian community would utter pronouncements, often while in a state of ecstasy, which were regarded as messages from God. These Christian prophets were believed to be God-inspired even as the ancient prophets had been, hence when their pronouncements were put in written form—as in the Revelation which stands at the

close of our New Testament—it was natural that divine origin and authoritative character should be claimed for them (see Rev. 1:10; 22:16-19; cf. 1 Cor. 7:40; 14:37).

As time passed and the sense of the Spirit's presence lost its vividness, there was more and more the tendency to look back with reverence to the earlier days. The apostles were thought of as bridging the gap between Christ and later Christians, even as Christ himself had established a connecting link between God and man. The apostolic age had been the golden age, when the Spirit had been present with power, when Christian doctrine and practice had been undefiled. With the spread of heresies this view gained strength. From present innovations, corruptions of the faith, the appeal was to what had come down from the primitive church, to what the apostles and those closely connected with them had practiced and taught. And hence the authoritative regard in which apostolic writings, or those so considered, were increasingly held.

The substance of what has just been said is that since Christ, the Spirit, and the apostles were all understood to speak with the voice of God, it was not unnatural that writings through which they spoke should come to be thought of as belonging to the class of Scripture, as themselves the Word of God.

Other influences more or less potent were also at work. Of these it will suffice to speak of two. (1) The feeling that in Christ God had established a "New Covenant" with men, and that documentary attestation of this covenant was greatly to be desired. At first prophetic passages in the Old Testament seemed to meet the need. But soon—as the warfare with Jews and Gnostics became more bitter—serious questions arose as to what was valid and what invalid in the Old Testament. Both Jesus and Paul had handled some of its matter with much freedom,

and when a later Christian used a passage from it as a proof-text it was always possible for his opponent to dispute his interpretation or even deny that this particular passage had the weight of final authority. How great the relief to be able to turn to writings which were not thus two-sided—for which one did not need to apologize! (2) The reading of Christian writings in church services along with passages from the Old Testament. The worship of the early Christian congregations was modeled after that of the Jewish synagogues. That being the case, of course the reading of the Jewish Scriptures was a prominent part of the service. But it was equally natural that, when a congregation received a letter from Paul, or when a copy of one of the Gospels came its way, this too should be read aloud to the assembled brethren. At first there would be no thought that recent Christian writings thus read were on a par with the ancient Law and Prophets. But gradually this custom, along with other tendencies, would break the distinction down.

The first definite move toward the compilation of a body of Christian Scriptures seems to have been made by Marcion, a prominent heretical teacher in Rome. Marcion's views differed from those of orthodox leaders at a number of points, notably in that he denied that the Jehovah of the Jewish Scriptures was the same as the God revealed by Jesus and hence entirely rejected the Old Testament. He selected those Christian writings which he thought best agreed with his ideas and so put forth a "canon" consisting of Luke's Gospel, ten letters of Paul's, and a work of his own called the *Antitheses*. This "Scripture" of Marcion's served both as a model and a challenge to his orthodox opponents. The church must not accept his limited and mutilated canon, but the fact of it having been put forth placed them in a measure under obligation to produce a canon which the church could and should accept. This was about the middle of

the second century. By the close of the same century the idea of an authoritative body of Christian Scriptures had been definitely accepted throughout the church, and there was a large measure of agreement as to what writings it should contain. The Jewish Bible was not cast off, however, as Marcion had planned. The Christian writings became a *New* Covenant, supplementing and outranking the old, but not displacing it.

C. The Closing of the New Testament Canon.

For us the New Testament consists of twenty-seven "books," and probably most users of these Christian Scriptures have never thought of the possibility of them including any more or less or other than just these twenty-seven. But for Christians of the earliest centuries the matter had not been so definitely fixed. Even after the idea of a Christian collection of sacred books over against the "Old" Testament had become commonplace, and after the inclusion in this collection of certain gospels, letters of Paul, and a few other writings had become so universal a practice on the part of orthodox Christians as no more to be questioned, a "closed" canon had not yet been attained. A considerable number of writings still remained on the outer edge of the inclosure, so to speak. Some were destined to find themselves inside, some outside, when the permanent wall was built.

Of seven books now in the New Testament it may be said that they were either ignored, looked upon with suspicion, or definitely rejected by representative Christian leaders, in one quarter of the world or another, during the early centuries. The seven are as follows: Hebrews, Revelation, James, 2 Peter, 2 John, 3 John, Jude. The last three on the list are very short, so that the fact of their being largely ignored by early Christian writers is not to be regarded as specially significant. But it is otherwise with the first four. Revelation, we find, was

pretty generally in favor in the West—that is, in the churches of Italy, Gaul, and North Africa—but was not so well received in Christian centers of the eastern Mediterranean world. Hebrews, on the other hand, was included in the canon in the East but ignored or rejected in the West. Origen (early third century) is the first writer to make any definite reference to James, and he refers to the epistle in such a way as to show that there was doubt as to its right to a place in the canon. Origen also refers to 2 Peter as a doubtful book. The early history of these two writings—James and 2 Peter—is obscure. We gather that it was harder for them to win an assured place in the New Testament than for any other books.

An even longer list might be made of Christian writings which for a time, in certain localities, were esteemed among the sacred books, but which were not able to maintain themselves in this exalted rank. In one of the oldest copies of the New Testament in existence—the famous Codex Sinaiticus of the fourth century—are to be found, in addition to the books known to us, two others of which probably the majority of present-day Bible readers have never so much as heard. They are the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas. The former was supposed, though incorrectly, to have been written by Barnabas, the companion of Paul, and was widely received as an inspired book, especially by the churches of Egypt. The Shepherd—an apocalypse, and hence somewhat resembling our Revelation—was regarded as Scripture by several church fathers of high rank such as Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria. Another of the few very old copies of the Greek Bible that have come down to us, Codex Alexandrinus, includes in its New Testament two writings which purport to be letters of Clement of Rome. One of them perhaps was written by Clement; the other certainly was

not. The so-called Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, in like manner, belonged to this Scripture borderland, as did also the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Gospel according to Peter, the Apocalypse of Peter, and the Acts of Paul.

It is not until well on in the fourth century that we find the New Testament beginning to assume the fixed form known to us. In the year 367 A. D. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, wrote an Easter letter to his people in which was included for their guidance a complete list of the books of the Bible. And Athanasius' list of the New Testament books coincides exactly (except for minor differences in order) with the New Testament as we have it to-day. It is the earliest list of which we have knowledge that does so coincide. The period of Athanasius was also the period of Jerome (died 420) and Augustine (died 430). The great prestige of these men availed much toward bringing about a general agreement as to what the Christian Scriptures should include. There was still more or less dissent in the East, but with respect to western Christendom it may almost be said that Jerome and Augustine wrote the closing chapters in the long controversy over the canon of the New Testament. But this long controversy, it should be remembered, had never really been concerned with the most vital parts of the New Testament. The four Gospels and Paul's letters seem to have been thought of as Christian Scriptures about as soon as Christian Scriptures were thought of at all—which is to say from the middle of the second century. It was the question of what other writings should be associated with these that received a final answer only after experience and discussion extending over some two and a half centuries.

We naturally ask what was the basis—or what were the bases—of judgment pro and con in the case of the

disputed books. What criteria did the church fathers have in mind when they held a certain book to be, or not to be, authoritative? It is a matter of much interest to interrogate their writings on this point. When we do so we learn that the criterion which loomed largest in their own minds was that of apostolic origin, direct or indirect. The apostolic names attached to James, 1 and 2 Peter, and 1, 2, and 3 John had entirely sufficient weight to secure their admission, except that in the case of several of these writings doubt was felt in some quarters as to whether the apostles whose names they bore had really written them. A work like the Shepherd of Hermas, on the other hand, suffered from its inability to show an apostolic lineage. So also with the letters which bore the name of Clement of Rome. Even the Gospels were felt to have their position strengthened when they could be shown to satisfy this test. Justin calls them the "Memoirs of the Apostles," while other fathers are at pains to point out the connection of Mark with Peter and of Luke with Paul. The title, "Acts of the Apostles," applied to the second part of Luke's work, reflects the same feeling. The book narrates "the acts of the apostles" only to a very limited degree, but to think of it in this way and present it in this guise served to make it satisfy the criterion of apostolicity. Incidentally its account of Paul's conversion and subsequent career must have been felt to provide important verification of Paul's claim that he was every whit an apostle, though not one of Jesus' original followers. Its position in our New Testament, just before Paul's letters, may be a reflection of this point of view.

But it must also be said that in thus stressing apostolicity as the norm for New Testament books the fathers were in a measure self-deceived. They are continually saying that a particular book is read in the churches

because it is apostolic (so a modern scholar remarks), whereas the truth is more nearly that it is deemed apostolic because it is so read. As to whether the writing in question was really from the hand of an apostle, or one who had been associated with an apostle, they seldom were in a position to say. What they did know was whether it had or had not *a long record of edifying use.* If it had they were disposed to think well of it—in other words to grant the weight of their approval to a decision which experience—custom—had already rendered in its slow but effective way.

D. Conclusion.

Such was the process by which miscellaneous writings, called forth by the needs of the early church, became a New Testament. The result was momentous. The mere fact that Christianity thus followed Judaism in ascribing unique divine authority to a collection of its classical literature was destined to influence profoundly the whole course of its history. No doubt it may be said that the influence has not been entirely good. It brought with it the danger of bibliolatry—a literal and slavish following of Scripture which is at the opposite pole from the spiritual religion of Jesus and of Paul. But this is only one side, and the lesser one. The formation of a New Testament insured the preservation of historical and religious treasures of inestimable value, and made it certain that the spirit and ideals of Jesus would emerge and claim attention from time to time, though the church which bore his name might fail to either publish or practice them.

And in the light of the momentous result the nature of the process is the more significant. Is not God's way of revealing Himself through the Bible much the same, after all, as His revealing of Himself through nature and

in the unfolding of human history? It was gradually, through a development of centuries which the wisdom of men was incapable of guiding and the foolishness of men incapable of thwarting, that the New Testament came to be.

CHAPTER VIII

HOW THE ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT CAME TO BE

A. The Original Language and Early Translations.

The original language, in the case of nearly all if not all of the New Testament writings, was Greek. This was the universal language of the eastern Mediterranean world when Christianity made its appearance in that world. Three centuries and more had passed since the conquests of Alexander the Great in what we call the Near East, and even before those conquests Greek expeditions, some military and others commercial in character, had carried the culture and the language of the Hellenes far from their native peninsula. And they took firm root. Alexander's empire crumbled at his death, and before long the territories which he had conquered were absorbed by the advancing Roman power. But the Greek culture remained. It did more than remain: it conquered Rome itself, as surely as Roman arms had conquered Greece. In New Testament times Greeks had long been the teachers of Romans in literature and the arts, while the Greek language was much in use even in the city of Rome. Of course the native tongues, in Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and the numerous other countries which made up the Roman Empire also continued in use. Latin, the official language of the Empire, was known to some extent in the East, though it was much less used here than in the western Mediterranean lands.

Such, in brief, was the linguistic situation. If the appeal of Christianity had been mainly to the cultured

classes, or if missionary effort had been confined to the great trade routes of the East traversed by Paul, there would have been little need for the translation of Christian writings during the early centuries. Greek copies would have met the need. But the appeal of the new religion was mainly to the humble, and to many of these another language—that native to their particular land—was more readily usable than Greek. And as missionaries carried Christianity farther afield—eastward into Assyria, southward into Egypt, and westward into Italy, Gaul, and North Africa—the need of translation became imperative. Tatian, who prepared the compilation of the four Gospels known as the Diatessaron, was an Assyrian. He did the work originally in Rome, using the Greek language, but soon afterward he translated it into Syriac, the language of his native land. Thus the Gospels, or rather a compilation of them, were circulating in Syriac before the close of the second century. The evidence for a Latin translation carries us nearly as far back. Tertullian, writing at Carthage about 200 A. D., knows and uses Latin versions of at least some parts of the New Testament. When translations into the Egyptian dialects were first made we do not know—perhaps not before the third or fourth century. Another early version was the Gothic, made from the Greek by Bishop Ulfilas in the fourth century. Armenian, Ethiopic, and Arabic versions were also made, though seemingly from the Syriac or other versions rather than directly from the Greek.

B. Translation into Modern Languages; Obstacles in the Way.

For the most part versions of Scripture in modern European languages can be traced back only to the twelfth to fourteenth centuries. However, some leaves from a German Bible dating from the eighth century are

extant, while portions of Scripture are known to have been translated into Anglo-Saxon by Bede, who died in 735. From these early beginnings down almost to our own time, the story of the translation of the Bible has been a story of obstacles and of the heroic labors of learned and consecrated men by which these have been in greater or less measure overcome. Of these obstacles two have been much the most serious.

(a) *The Opposition of Church Authorities.* Such opposition was non-existent in the early church, and it has been compartively little felt in modern times, but through the long Middle Ages it was a powerful force. A Latin version made by Jerome, a learned father who lived about 340-420 A. D., gradually became the standard Bible of the church in western Europe. (It remains the official Bible of the Roman Catholic Church to this day.) The priests—theoretically, if not always in fact—were able to use this Latin Bible, and it was felt to be undesirable that the rank and file of the people should read the Scriptures for themselves. Naturally, therefore, attempts to make translations into the everyday languages of the people of the different lands were frowned upon. This attitude on the part of popes, bishops, and others in ecclesiastical power may well seem strange to us, yet it is not hard to understand. The church leaders took the view that the common people could not understand the Bible rightly, hence would get foolish and dangerous notions from it if they were allowed to read it freely. The remedy or preventive was to keep them from reading it. The difficulty was a real one, and is still with us. The reading of the Bible without correct understanding of it is and always has been productive of much nonsense and not a little harm. But in practice the attempt to regulate the matter by denying the use of the Bible to the laity, making the clergy the sole authorities as to how it is to be understood, has not

worked well. Most of us, in the modern world, are convinced that such a method is bad, but we should give the leaders of the medieval church credit for having dealt seriously with a problem which we ourselves have not solved.

However there was another reason, less creditable, for this attitude. During the Middle Ages the church became very corrupt. Its leaders often wielded tyrannous power, while many of the clergy under them were steeped in ignorance and led immoral lives. The contrast between the religion of the church and the religion of the Bible was glaring, and it was a measure of personal safety for the leaders of the church to keep the people in ignorance of what the Bible taught. To men who, in the interest of their own lust and avarice, wish to control their fellow men, the "Thus sayeth the Lord" of the Hebrew prophets and the "I say unto you" of Jesus are highly embarrassing. But happily, even in this period not all of the church's leaders were men of such character.

(b) *The Lack of Good Copies from Which to Translate.* The "original Greek" of the New Testament writings had long since been lost. No doubt all of them were written on papyrus, which is not very durable when in frequent use. Perhaps in some cases a number of copies may have been made at the same time, but even so they would not last for many years. They would be in roll form, not leaf books, and with frequent rolling and unrolling the life of the brittle papyrus would not be long. Meanwhile the original manuscripts would be copied, and the copies copied in turn, as the demand for the writings increased. By and by the "codex," or leaf book, took the place of the roll, while prepared skins, called parchment or vellum, came to be used instead of papyrus. The New Testament could now be produced in a single large volume, though to make such a copy must

have been a laborious and expensive task. Another and more important advance was made with the invention of printing, about the middle of the fifteenth century. It was important not only in that it made the copying of books much easier and less expensive, but also in the far great accuracy which the new method made possible. In the course of the thirteen or fourteen centuries of hand copying, an enormous number of deviations from the original, and variations from one another, had naturally found their way into the manuscripts of the New Testament.

In short, the way in which the New Testament writings had been handed down from generation to generation and from century to century, had not been such as to insure the accuracy of the copies which translators used, when translation into English and other languages began. At first little attempt was made to go back to the Greek. Jerome's Latin version—the Vulgate, as it was called—was the source almost always used. It had been far from perfect when made, and of course it did not escape the confusion wrought by centuries of hand copying. But the handicap was not to be avoided in any great measure by going back of the Vulgate to the Greek, since the Greek manuscripts then available were very inferior. Nor did immediate improvement follow when printing superseded hand-copying. The New Testament, whether in Greek, Latin, or English, could now become more stereotyped, assume a form that would become familiar through use, and which would be but little subject to change in copying. But this is not to say that the form thus assumed would be correct or accurate. For a New Testament to be produced which would be relatively close to the original further centuries of research and labor were required. It was necessary that scholars should collect manuscripts, study variations, examine minutely the early translations into Latin, Syriac, and

other languages, note the wording of New Testament quotations in the writings of early fathers of the church which have survived, and thus gradually arrive at principles to be used in determining what readings commend themselves as original.

This obstacle was by no means as keenly felt by the translators themselves as the other one. It was not possible for them to know, as is now known, how defective their sources were. But if less realized it was not less difficult to overcome. In fact a much longer time was required to do away with it. By 1611, when our King James Version was made, serious ecclesiastical opposition to the translation of the Bible had come to an end, at least in Protestant countries. But we shall see that not before the making of the Revised Version, well on in the nineteenth century, had the handicap of poor sources been in any large measure overcome.

C. Wyclif—The English New Testament in Manuscript Form.

Bede had translated portions of Scripture into Anglo-Saxon in the eighth century, as we have seen. He was at work on John's Gospel during his last illness, and a pupil of his, in a letter to a fellow-pupil, has preserved a touching account of his eagerness to complete the task before he died. Other translators were also at work. By the tenth century, or a little later, Anglo-Saxon translations of all four Gospels, as well as of the Book of Psalms and other parts of the Old Testament, were in use. Then came the invasion of England by the Normans under William the Conqueror (1066), opening a new era in English history. The three centuries immediately following was a period of assimilation and transition. The Anglo-Saxon tongue was being enriched by assimilating vocabulary and other characteristics from the Norman-French. The result was a language still by

no means identical with English as we know it, yet much more similar than the Anglo-Saxon of Bede had been. And a fusion of populations was going on, along with the fusion of languages. Gradually a unified nation was forming itself. It was a nation with a strong sense of independence—a decided tendency to resent interference from without, whether from the rulers of other nations or from the head of the church at Rome. And it had another marked characteristic—a growing disposition of the common people to assert themselves.

These characteristics of the times were reflected in the life and work of John Wyclif, who was born in the north of England about 1320 and died in 1384. He was a preacher and professor in the University of Oxford, and took much interest in the social problems of his time and in affairs of state. We do not know his life in detail, but we know enough to realize that he was a great man, a powerful figure in the England of the fourteenth century.

Wyclif's work as a Bible translator was done during the closing years of his life. For years previous he had been taking an active part in the struggle of Parliament to limit the power of the pope in English affairs. He had supported a refusal to pay a bill for back taxes which had come from Rome, and had argued in favor of a proposal that the church's revenues in England should themselves be taxed. He had served on a commission sent to the Continent to confer with the pope's representatives, and had witnessed the complete failure to come to terms. These interests and activities served to open Wyclif's eyes ever increasingly to the bad state of the church of his day. At a time when the people of England were in crying need of spiritual and social leadership, the pope and his representatives in the kingdom were playing the role of oppressors rather than guides. And along with this realization came another—

the realization that what the church lacked the Bible contained. The spirit of love, of service, of brotherhood, of humility, was what the times needed. The church, alas, had lost it, but in the Gospels it was still to be found. There it was clearly set forth and glorified. The trouble was that the church, with its corrupt officials and ignorant clergy, was everywhere in evidence, while but little of the Bible was available in a language which the people could read. Wyclif labored, through his preaching and teaching, to supply the need of simple instruction in what the Bible taught—particularly the gospel of Jesus. Followers of his, both clergy and laymen, extended his influence by serving as itinerant preachers here and there. But with this he was not satisfied. He undertook the work of translation, and in 1382, two years before his death, had the joy of having rendered the entire New Testament from the Latin Vulgate into the English tongue.

A fellow-worker, Nicholas of Hereford, meanwhile translated the Old Testament. The entire work was then gone over and carefully revised by John Purvey, a disciple of Wyclif's, who completed his task some four years after the master's death. Thus was the first complete Bible in English produced. The difficulties in the way of its securing a wide reading were great. The church of course opposed it. Wyclif himself escaped a martyr's death only by reason of the fear which his popularity and the support of his cause by powerful nobles inspired. Some years after his death, in 1408, a convocation held under the archbishop of Canterbury, head of the English church, solemnly declared that "It is a dangerous thing . . . to translate the text of the holy Scripture out of one tongue into another." The work "now lately composed in the time of John Wycliffe" is specifically mentioned, and it is decreed that anyone reading it, or any other unauthorized translation, will "be

punished as a favourer of heresy and error." What dire form such punishment could take, when the will of a heresy-hunting pope and his representatives was unrestrained, a later generation was to learn.

Another great handicap suffered by the Wyclif version of Scripture—in fact by Wyclif's reforming work as a whole—was the lack of popularizing facilities which the invention of printing, in the next century, supplied. A manuscript Bible was bulky and expensive, so much so that comparatively few could afford to own the whole work. We read that as late as 1520 "some gave a load of hay for a few chapters of St. James or of St. Paul." But in spite of difficulties copies were made, circulated, and read. About a hundred and seventy copies, of the whole Bible or parts of it, have survived to our own time. Wyclif has been called "the morning star of the Reformation," and his influence in this direction was exerted through his translation of the New Testament more than in any other way.

D. Tyndale and Others (to 1611)—The English New Testament in Printed Form.

William Tyndale was born in Gloucestershire, England, in 1484, a century after Wyclif died. He studied at Oxford and Cambridge and then returned to his native county to become tutor in the home of a baronet. Here his unorthodox ideas involved him in a good deal of controversy. His reply to a "learned man" who said it would be better to be without God's laws than the pope's has often been quoted. Tyndale declared that he defied the pope and all his laws, and added: "If God spare my life, ere many years I will cause a boy that driveth the plough shall know more of the Scripture than thou doest." Already for some time the idea of making a translation of the Bible, and having it printed for wide circulation, had been at work in the

young scholar's mind. At Cambridge he had studied under the great Greek scholar Erasmus, who in 1516 had published the first printed edition of the New Testament in Greek. Tyndale had been impressed with the value of thus having the New Testament in its original tongue, but there was another need which seemed to him even greater. He "had perceaued by experyence, how that it was impossible to stablysh the laye people in any truth, excepte ye scripture were playnly layde before their eyes in their mother tonge." The Bible had already been printed in Spanish, Italian, French, Dutch, German, and Bohemian, but England had only the expensive and sparsely translated manuscripts of the versions prepared by Wyclif and his followers.

Tyndale's work as a translator extended over the years 1524-1536. This entire period was spent abroad, mostly in Germany. Previously he had tried to secure the support of the bishop of London for his project, but the result had been disappointing. He became convinced "not only that there was no rowme in my lorde of londons palace to translate the new testament, but also that there was no place to do it in all englonde." In Germany the Reformation movement, under Luther, was already well under way. In that country his work could be carried on with greater safety and with better facilities. He resided succesively at Hamburg, Cologne, Worms, Marburg, and Antwerp. He is said to have visited Luther at Wittenberg, though there is some uncertainty as to this. His frequent changes of location were mainly due to the fact that the church authorities were constantly on his trail. No doubt his work, and his life, would have been cut short if he had remained in England, but even with the greater freedom of the continental cities in his favor the respite could not be for long. At Antwerp, in 1535, he was betrayed by one whom he thought to be his friend. There followed an

imprisonment of nearly a year and a half, and on October 6, 1536, he was strangled to death and his body burnt.

But those twelve years had been immensely fruitful, and Tyndale did not consider the price too high. Early in 1526, at Worms, the publication of a small octavo edition of the New Testament had been carried to completion. A large quarto edition, begun at Cologne, seems to have been put into circulation at about the same time. Six thousand copies in all are said to have been printed. Later editions brought the number to perhaps fifteen thousand by 1530. Secret channels for circulation in England were quickly found, and the war was on—the war between the people, eager for copies, and the church authorities, who collected and burned the copies as rapidly as possible and gave to those who circulated them the choice of penance or the stake.

And it was the people who won. The version of Tyndale did not receive the sanction of the ecclesiastical and civil authorities, but another way was found of yielding to the popular demand. Another translator, who had kept within the good graces of the authorities, was encouraged to prepare a new version. His name was Miles Coverdale, and his first edition was published in 1535. It was dedicated to King Henry VIII, and a later edition, issued in 1537, presents itself as "Set forth with the Kinges most gracious licence." Thus was answered Tyndale's dying prayer that the Lord would open the king of England's eyes. At last a translation of the Bible in English had been "authorized." It was a precedent of the greatest significance.

The Coverdale version was the first complete Bible in English. Tyndale's labors had been mainly with the New Testament, though before his death he had published the first five books of the Old Testament, also the Book of Jonah and some detached matter from other books.

The year 1537 saw the publication of another "authorized version," in addition to Coverdale's. Its title page bore the name of Thomas Matthew, but it was almost certainly prepared by John Rogers—the same who was burned at the stake under Queen Mary in 1555. The name of Matthew was apparently an alias, though why it was assumed is not clear. This work proves upon examination to be a compilation from Tyndale and Coverdale. The entire New Testament is from one of the later, revised editions of Tyndale. Part of the Old Testament material is from Tyndale and part from Coverdale. Apparently some of Tyndale's manuscript material, which he had not been able to get printed before his death, was used in the making of this version. He and Rogers had been friends. Rogers' own part of the work is seen most conspicuously in the notes, which were rather copious and often controversial in tone. In the main the work was a reissue of Tyndale, and there is a tragic irony in the fact that Henry VIII, who had repeatedly condemned Tyndale, now authorized the sale and reading of this book. He seems to have acted on the advice of Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury since 1532, and Thomas Cromwell, his secretary of state. Cranmer had been impressed with the superior merits of the Matthew Bible, and induced Cromwell to intercede with the king on its behalf.

The next version to be listed is the "Great Bible," seven editions of which were printed during the years 1539-41. Cromwell and Cranmer were the chief patrons, Coverdale the chief editor. The name given it was due to its large size. Naturally a translation thus produced would be much indebted to its predecessors. It was admittedly based on Matthew, but was supposed to be prepared with more critical thoroughness. Probably the notes in the Matthew Bible had proved a stumbling-block. In the case of the Great Bible the support of

the king was again secured; indeed this time it went farther than ever before. It was decreed that before a specified day every church in the kingdom should have a copy set up in a convenient place. For a time the English people had facilities for getting acquainted with the Bible such as had never been known before. It was a great blessing, but we gather that it brought also some confusion in its train. A certain bishop is constrained to admonish his people as to the manner in which they should read the Bibles placed for their use in church: "That there should be no such number meet together there as to make a multitude. That no exposition should be made thereupon but what is declared in the book itself. That it be not read with noise in time of divine service; or that any disputation or contention be used at it." Later he speaks with even more vigor: "Diverse wilful and unlearned persons inconsiderately and indiscreetly . . . read the same especially and chiefly at the time of divine service . . . yea in the time of the sermon and declaration of the word of God." If this is not stopped, the bishop declares, he will be obliged to have the Bibles removed. In such a controversy we can sympathize with both sides.

The Genevan Bible was published in 1560. Henry VIII had died, and under his son and successor, Edward VI, England had become definitely a Protestant land. This did not mean that it was tolerant or that religious and social conditions were ideal, for such was not the case. But Cranmer was still at the head of church affairs, and the hard-won freedom in the printing and reading of the Bible was fully maintained. But after a reign of six and a half years Edward died, and "Bloody Mary" came to the throne. For five years England was officially Roman Catholic once more. Cranmer, John Rogers, and many others lost their lives, and Bibles which had been set up in churches were burnt.

But a systematic searching out and confiscation of copies of Scripture seems not to have taken place, and though the work of translation and publication was necessarily suspended in England, Protestant exiles on the Continent were hard at work.

One group of these exiles had located at Geneva, in Switzerland. When Queen Mary died, in 1558, they had a translation of the Bible already under way. Most of the colony returned to England, but William Whittingham and several others remained to finish the work. It was completed in 1560, and with Elizabeth now on the throne its circulation in England was not opposed. In a short time it became the household Bible of the country as none other had ever been. The exiles had indeed done a worthy piece of work. In the New Testament their main basis was the "Matthew" version, which is to say that it really goes back to Tyndale. But the Geneva translators brought painstaking care and sound scholarship to their task of revising and improving their predecessors' work. Moreover—and here is probably the main secret of the new version's success—they gave attention to convenience, to usability. In size the Genevan Bible was a moderate quarto, far more convenient to handle than the huge folios of Coverdale, Matthew, and the Great Bible. The clearer and more easily read Roman letters were substituted for the black Gothic type of previous editions. The division into verses was introduced. And there was a marginal commentary, less controversial and more practically useful than the notes which had hindered rather than furthered the Matthew Bible's success. The translators themselves state with reference to this marginal commentary that they have not only tried to render the text faithfully but have " in all hard places moste syncerely expounded the same." Their efforts to help their readers in the "hard places" were appreciated. It is said that when

the Genevan Bible was finally passing into oblivion, after going through about a hundred and sixty editions, the people complained that "they could not see into the sense of the Scripture for lack of the spectacles of those Genevan annotators." We shall see that it required a generation for the King James Version to displace the work of the Genevans in popular esteem.

The Bishops' Bible, as it was called, appeared in 1568. When Elizabeth had succeeded Mary as queen ten years earlier, the Great Bible had more or less automatically resumed its place as the authorized Scripture of the realm. But it suffered in competition with the Genevan Bible. The popular version of the exiles was threatening to displace it for public as well as private reading, a thing which was deemed subversive of ecclesiastical discipline. A remedy was sought in the making of a new version, in which the errors of the Great Bible would be corrected and at the same time the language made more popular. The Bishops' Bible, thus produced, was so called because many of those engaged in the work of revision were bishops, Matthew Parker, then archbishop of Canterbury, being the prime mover in the work. Naturally some parts were better done than others. The version exhibits better scholarship in the New Testament than in the Old. Its success was not great. It displaced the Great Bible where the latter had been used in the churches, but it did not supplant the Genevan version in the people's regard.

The Rheims and Doway version was a Roman Catholic Bible, in English, published in 1582 (New Testament) and 1609-10 (Old Testament). In 1568 an English Catholic scholar had founded a theological college at Doway (now usually spelled Douai) in northern France. His name was William Allen; he was afterward made cardinal. In 1578 the school was removed to Rheims, but in 1593 it again occupied the old quarters

at Doway. Hence the twofold name attached to the version, which was the work of Catholic scholars connected with this school. The attitude of these scholars toward their task—indeed the attitude of Catholic scholarship in general at this period toward the translation of the Bible into the popular tongues—comes out clearly in the long "Preface to the Reader" at the beginning of the New Testament. We may quote a couple of sentences. The translators do not share the "erroneous opinions of necessitie that the holy scriptures should alwaies be in our mother tongue, or that they ought or were ordained of God to be read indifferently of all." Why, then, do they undertake the work? The Protestant versions, they explain, are bad—their influence pernicious: something must be done to check their use. "We therefore, hauing compassion to see our beloued countrie men, with extreme danger of their soules, to vse onely such prophane translations, and erroneous mens mere phantasies, for the pure and blessed word of truth, much also moued therevnto by the desires of many deuout persons: haue set forth, for you (benigne readers) the new Testament to begin withal, trusting that it may giue occasion to you, after diligent perusing thereof, to lay away at lest such their impure versions as hitherto you haue ben forced to occupie." Exactly two centuries had passed since Wyclif's New Testament had been put in circulation. World progress had been enormous, without precedent, in those centuries. A religious revolution, started by Luther in Germany, had shaken Europe so thoroughly that even the Roman Church had not been left unchanged. But the forced changes, after all, were not deep. The attitude toward Scripture translation is typical. In Wyclif's time the English church (then under Rome) had officially declared that to translate the Bible was "a dangerous thing," and after two centuries Rome's position was precisely the same.

The Rheims New Testament was translated from the Latin Vulgate, not from the Greek. The translation is extremely literal. For this reason the style of many passages is quite un-English, as the sense is unintelligible. The principle followed was "that in other writings it is ynough to giue in translation sense for sense, but that in Scriptures, lest we misse the sense, we must keepe the very wordes." The trouble with this is that keeping the words is often the surest way to miss the sense. Yet the version is not without merits. The choice of words is sometimes happy, and in this and other respects the Rheims-Doway Bible has been found worthy of study by translators of subsequent years and centuries. It forms the basis of the Bible still used by English-speaking Roman Catholics, though it has passed through a number of revisions in which the English has been improved.

E. Summary and Conclusion.

What has been said in this chapter has been by way of sketching the historical background of the English New Testament as we know it today. None of the versions with which we have here had to do is in actual use in our time except the Rheims version, and it has been greatly changed. But this is not to say that the history of the New Testament in English begins to have interest and importance for us only when the King James Version appears on the scene. That version, as we shall see in the next chapter, was by no means an independent or original product. It stood in closest connection with its predecessors; and the Revised Version, which in our time has to some extent displaced it, stood in closest connection with it. The English New Testament has been an evolution, even as was the original New Testament. Gradually, through the centuries, the steps of its progress can be traced. And as we trace them we see that the progress of the New Testament has been closely parallel

with the progress of ideals of fair dealing and liberty in the English-speaking race. The most significant figures in our story—Wyclif, Tyndale, and the Genevan exiles—hazarded their lives for the giving of the Bible to their countrymen, not from abstract theological motives, but from motives that were intensely concrete and practical. Their country was in need. Injustice, immorality, ignorance, were working havoc in the land. And the sum and substance of the need, these men felt, was that Englishmen should know better—and so do better—the will of God. How was God's will to be made known to them; where was the way of righteousness best set forth? In the Bible, these men answered. That it was the right answer, for their day, is beyond doubt. If in our day we recognize other voices speaking of God and of righteousness, it is fair to ask whether perhaps the Bible, directly or indirectly, has called them forth. If this is not conceded we may let it pass. That God should speak—not how he speaks—is the vital thing: that God should speak and that men should hear and heed. But is it not still through the Bible, preëminently, that God's voice is heard?

CHAPTER IX

THE KING JAMES AND THE REVISED VERSIONS

A. The King James Version (1611).

The King James whose name our most-used English Bible bears was James I, who came to the throne upon the death of Queen Elizabeth in 1603. In this case the change of monarchs did not mean a return to Roman Catholicism as the official religion of the land. That England was to be prevailingly a Protestant country was by this time a settled fact. But there remained the question of how thoroughly, how radically, Protestant it was to be. The Church of England, which had come into being when Henry VIII declared the country independent of the pope at Rome, was not radically Protestant. For one thing, it was still an "episcopal" church, which is to say that the affairs of the congregations were regulated not by church officers whom the members themselves elected, but by bishops appointed by some higher power. The pope had formerly held the appointing power; it was now exercised by the king. In many respects the rites and ceremonies of the church, also, were much as they had been under Rome. But there was a party in England—the Puritans—who were not at all satisfied with this sort of a reformation. They wanted something much more radical. Elizabeth had found them troublesome. Some were executed, others banished from the country, in her reign. But their trials were destined to be still greater under James I. This sovereign was a colossal egotist and held firmly to the

doctrine of the divine right of kings. He had considerable knowledge, but it was built upon a weak foundation of intelligence. With the movement for more democracy in religion he could have no possible sympathy; it was too likely to lead to a demand for democracy in the civil government. "No bishop, no king," was a favorite maxim of his.

That such a man should have launched a movement so beneficent as the making of the King James Version of the English Bible is one of the strange paradoxes of history. It grew out of the Hampton Court Conference, called by the king soon after the beginning of his reign (1604). The conference was supposed to be for the purpose of considering a petition for further reforms which the Puritan leaders had presented. In reality it served mainly to give the king a chance to display the theological learning of which he was so proud. One suggested reform, however, met with his approval: that a new translation of the Bible should be made. The putting forth of this proposal gave him a chance to berate the Genevan version, in which he had found "some notes very partial, untrue, seditious, and savouring too much of dangerous and traitorous conceits." For example, in Exodus 1:19 a marginal note made disobedience to kings allowable. In short, the suggestion found King James in a favorable mood. Otherwise it would almost certainly have come to naught, as there was no particular enthusiasm for it on the part of the dignitaries of the established church. The bishop of London remarked impatiently that there would be no end of translating if every man's humor was to be followed. But the king was back of the movement and arrangements for the beginning of the work were soon under way.

At this time the situation in England with regard to Protestant Bibles was as we left it in the last chapter.

The Bishops' Bible was the official version of the church, but the circulation of the Genevan version was permitted and it was much the more popular. Probably none of the earlier versions was much in use. No doubt the Puritans—from whom the suggestion for a new translation first came—were moved mainly by dissatisfaction with the Bishops' Bible, whereas it was the Genevan version that King James particularly wished to have ousted, as we have seen. The disagreement of the two parties readily resolved itself into an agreement at this point, and there resulted one of the great Bible versions of all time.

Arrangements were completed before the end of 1604, but for some reason the actual work seems not to have been begun until 1607. The names of forty-seven scholars appear on the list of those who had a part in it. They were divided into six groups and a part of the Bible assigned to each. Four labored with the Old Testament and two with the New. The appointments were made, nominally, by the king. Probably lists of names had been submitted by the two universities, Oxford and Cambridge, though there is no definite information as to this. At any rate a considerable number of the scholars appointed were connected with one or other of the universities, as was natural. Two of the groups had their place of meeting at Oxford, two at Cambridge, and two at Westminster (London). The scholarship represented by the forty-seven translators was of a high order, and it was further provided that "any learned man in the land" should be consulted by letter when it was thought that his counsel would be helpful. The rules of procedure included various other provisions intended to safeguard the thoroughness and accuracy of the work. As to its actual progress little is known. We learn from the preface, however, that two years and nine months were consumed in the task of translation, and the preparing of

the product for the press is said to have required an additional nine months. It is evident that in respect to organization, scholarship, and other facilities this was the most ambitious attempt at rendering the Bible into English that had yet been made. Happily, King James did not interfere in the enterprise after it was under way.

In the rules for the guidance of the translators, already referred to, it was explicitly decreed that there should be "no marginal notes at all" except where they might prove necessary to make clear the meaning of Greek or Hebrew words. The bishop of London had mentioned this point at the Hampton Court Conference and the king had quickly taken it up. He had had experience with one annotated Bible, and that was enough. Thus the King James Version had to present itself to the people without the running commentary which had contributed so much to the popularity of the Genevan Bible.

Another provision of the rules—it was the very first rule, in fact—was that the Bishops' Bible should be the basis of the new translation, and should be "as little altered as the truth of the original will permit." But the use of other English versions, in a supplementary way, was permitted, and in their preface the translators tell us that they consulted also translations in other languages, ancient and modern, and commentaries as well. It is also to be remembered that they had Greek and Hebrew scholarship at their command. Here, however, they were handicapped by the lack of good Hebrew and Greek texts from which to translate, a matter already referred to (in the last chapter) and to be referred to shortly again. Where they abandon the Bishops' Bible in favor of another English version it appears most often to be the Genevan version which they follow, but they are also a good deal indebted to the Rheims version, especially in the choice of suitable phrases and words. And of course in basing their work

on the Bishops' Bible they were basing it, indirectly, on Tyndale and Coverdale. All this reminds us that our "Authorized Version" is itself a Revised Version, in intent as well as in fact. "Truly, (good Christian Reader,)" say the translators, "we neuer thought from the beginning, that we should neede to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one . . . but to make a good one better or out of many good ones, one principall good one, not justly to be excepted against: that hath bene our indeauour, that our marke."

In 1611 the great task reached completion. Two editions, of large folio size, were printed in that year, also a small-size edition of the New Testament. A third folio edition was printed in 1613. Unfortunately the workmanship of these early editions was not as careful as it might have been. The two editions printed in 1611 show numerous small variations, and the edition of 1613 differs from both at many points. Nor did the version assume a standard and invariable form in subsequent years as edition followed edition in almost countless array. In the middle of the last century a committee of the American Bible Society, after examining six different editions of the King James Version, reported that they had found variations in text and punctuation reaching a total of nearly twenty-four thousand. Probably the number is smaller in editions now in use. It is still true, however, that "we have a standard translation, but not a standard text." The multiplication of copies of a book by the printing method is vastly more accurate than when hand copying was the method in use, but even printers and proofreaders are not infallible.

There has been much controversy as to whether the King James Version was ever really "authorized." On the title-page the words "Appointed to be read in churches" occur, but in surviving copies of several of the early editions these words are not found, and if they

are based on any formal enactment—whether of king, parliament, or church—all record of such action has been lost.

However it may have been with formal authorization, it is certain that general approval of the work by its users did not come at once. Much indifference and a good deal of violent hostility were displayed. The translators were prepared for this. In their preface they remark that "Zeal to promote the common good, whether it be by devising anything ourselves, or revising that which hath been laboured by others, deserveth certainly much respect and esteem, but yet findeth but cold entertainment in the world. It is welcomed with suspicion instead of love, and with emulation instead of thanks: and if there be any hole left for cavil to enter (and cavil, if it do not find a hole, will make one) it is sure to be misconstrued, and in danger to be condemned." The words were prophetic. In 1645 we find John Lightfoot, the great Hebrew scholar, urging the House of Commons to consider the need of another revision. We hear of the matter being discussed in Parliament in 1653 and again in 1656, but nothing came of it. As late as 1659 a learned theologian, Dr. Robert Gell, wrote an "Essay" of more than eight hundred folio pages in disparagement of the version. Meanwhile the Genevan version continued in circulation, with new editions appearing for a generation after 1611.

It is to be remembered that this was the period of the Civil Wars and of the Cromwell regime. Theological controversy was rife. Catholics were arrayed against Protestants, Episcopalians against Presbyterians, Calvinists against Arminians. There was a constant war of printing presses, and more deadly weapons were all too freely employed. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the criticisms of the King James Bible were directed less against its scholarship than its theology. Contro-

versialists of this or that group found in it a fatal bias in favor of the views of their opponents: it was therefore a vicious book and ought to be suppressed. But this era passed. The passing of the "Commonwealth" and the restoration of the Stuart line of kings in 1660 marked a strong reaction. It is not entirely a coincidence that from that date forward the version of 1611 had little trouble maintaining its position as the standard Bible of the English-speaking race. Its intrinsic merit had a chance to win for it the regard which it deserved.

To dwell at length upon the merits of this version would be superfluous. It was the climax of nearly a century of effort—beginning with Tyndale—to find an English embodiment for the Christian Scriptures that would be worthy of their unique character and at the same time facilitate their use in worship and for the guidance of life. In the Bible produced in the reign of King James this effort was crowned with success in unusual degree. The translators did not achieve perfection. The praise of their English style has sometimes reached the point of fulsomeness. It was antiquated style even when the version was made, and it is at least a fair question whether in our time the language has not become obsolete to the extent of interfering seriously with the Bible's proper use. And the Hebrew and Greek texts back of their English were not as near to the original of the Old and New Testament books as it was possible to get. This the scholarship of a later generation was to show. Nevertheless the King James Version stands, after three centuries, as a great achievement —as nearly permanent in its use and significance as things human can expect to be.

B. The Revised Version of 1881.

The movement which resulted in the making of what is now known as the Revised Version was launched in

1870. The supremacy of the King James Version had then lasted for more than two centuries, a fact the more notable when we recall how frequently revision had followed upon revision in the period of less than a century between Tyndale and King James. However, the period had not been one of entire quiescence. Many users of the Authorized Version to-day would be surprised if they were to see a copy of one of the early editions of that work. The spelling of words, which has been modernized in editions now in use, is in itself enough to make the King James Bible of the seventeenth century seem a quite different Bible from ours. And other more radical changes have been introduced from time to time, "introduced silently and without authority by men whose very names are often unknown." It should not be understood that these alterations were really serious, except from the point of view of one who regards the very words of Scripture as having a magically sacred character. But the fact that they were made shows that efforts to improve the English Bible were not at a standstill in the long period between the Authorized Version and the Revised Version. Further evidence is to be seen in the numerous "paraphrases" of parts of Scripture which appeared in the early part of the period, and in the more or less independent translations of individual books which became common at a later date. A list of editions shows that in the fifty years between 1800 and 1850 there were only nine years in which there did not appear "some fresh translation, or new edition of such translation, of some or all the books of the Bible." In 1856 a motion was introduced in the House of Commons that the queen be asked to appoint a commission to consider "amendments of the authorized version of the Bible," but after discussion the motion was withdrawn. But outside of Parliament the discussion went on. In 1857 a group of prominent British scholars indicated what they thought was

needed by publishing a revision of the Gospel of John, followed later by other portions of the New Testament. Finally, in 1870, the Church of England, acting through the Convocation of Canterbury, took official action which issued in the appointment of Old Testament and New Testament revision companies, and in the actual beginning of the work. The New Testament company began its labors on June 22 of that year.

Probably the main reason for the matter coming to a head at this time is to be found in the great progress which had been made in Biblical studies, particularly studies looking toward the production of a Greek New Testament nearer to the original than the editions which had hitherto been used. Thanks to the achievements of scholars like Hort in England and Tischendorf in Germany—to mention only two of the most eminent—a scientific method of studying the mass of manuscript material had been evolved. Through the use of this method, and aided by the recovery of ancient manuscripts that had not before been known to the world of modern scholarship, a Greek New Testament much more accurate than any known to previous translators had now been produced. The next great step, it was felt, was to make available for the people, in English, this improved New Testament which scholars already had in Greek.

The time consumed in the making of the Revised Version was much longer than that required for the completion of the version of 1611. This was because of the method of procedure adopted. It was determined that the work should be done with a maximum of thoroughness, regardless of the expenditure of time required. An obvious way of economizing time would have been to have divided the company of New Testament revisers into groups (and likewise the Old Testament company), so that work might proceed along two or more lines at

the same time. We have seen that the Authorized Version translators were thus divided, but in the case of the Revised Version this plan was not adopted. The entire company, for each Testament, worked through the whole Testament. Both companies met in Westminster Abbey, London. The New Testament company regularly held four-day sessions once a month. The members of course had other professional duties which they could not lay aside. At the end of about six years the entire New Testament had been gone over once, and a second revision was completed in an additional two and a half years. There followed a final checking up—practically a third revision—which occupied two more years. On November 11, 1880, after ten years and five months of labor, the work was brought to a close. It was issued to the public in May of 1881. (The Old Testament followed in 1885.)

The number of New Testament revisers varied from twenty-four to twenty-eight. (There were twenty-seven to thirty-seven in the Old Testament company.) Due to deaths and resignations the personnel changed somewhat in the course of the long period. Naturally the Church of England was more largely represented than any other religious group. This was not only because the movement was sponsored by this church but also because more competent scholars were included within its membership than in that of any other church body in England. But the committee of revision originally appointed by this church had been expressly empowered "to invite the coöperation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong." Thus it happened that of a total of fifty-two revisers, serving in 1880, while thirty-six were Episcopalians there were also seven Presbyterians, four Independents (or Congregationalists), two Baptists, two Wesleyans (or Methodists), and one Unitarian. A

Roman Catholic, Cardinal Newman, was invited to serve with the New Testament company but declined.

The Presbyterian members were professors in the universities and theological colleges of Scotland, so that the work of revision was in British, not merely English hands. And use was made of the authorization to invite scholars of "whatever nation" to a yet greater and more significant extent.

On July 7, 1870, the Convocation of Canterbury voted "to invite the coöperation of some American divines." The next month Dr. Joseph Angus, one of the British revisers, arrived in New York authorized to open negotiations for American participation in the work. By a happy circumstance he conferred with Professor Philip Schaff, of Union Theological Seminary, who became and continued to be the leader of the revision movement in America. Dr. Schaff was widely known both in Europe and in America, and was everywhere held in high regard for his learning and his character. He was particularly conspicuous for the breadth of his interests and his spirit —his freedom from the partisan prejudices betrayed by so many religious leaders of his time. The task of getting together an able and representative committee in this country, and of securing smooth and effective coöperation with the British revisers, was destined to be hard, and it was most fortunate that the leadership of the enterprise was in such competent hands. The situation in this country was very different from that in England in that here there was no state church, or dominant church body, to take the matter in hand. Indeed if it had been entrusted to any one of the denominations or denominational agencies in America it could scarcely have attained much success. Few competent scholars could have been secured, and the project would have been viewed with indifference or suspicion by adherents of other groups.

As to the principles followed in choosing the American revisers, Dr. Schaff himself has this to say: "In the delicate task of selection, reference was had, first of all, to ability, experience and reputation in Biblical learning and criticism; next to denominational connection and standing, so as to have a fair representation of the leading churches and theological institutions; and last, to local convenience, in order to secure regular attendance." How these principles operated in the actual selection may be seen by consulting a list of names and addresses of the men who had a part in the work. It will be seen that nearly all of them were or had been professors in theological seminaries, universities, and colleges; that nine denominations were represented (Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Baptist, Methodist, Reformed, Lutheran, Unitarian, Friends); and that the states represented were New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Delaware, and Virginia. "Local convenience" meant comparative nearness to New York, where the meetings were held.

The lists include a total of thirty-four names—fifteen in the Old Testament company and nineteen in the New. But not all of these served the entire time. In the New Testament company the actual working force, through nearly the whole time, numbered thirteen. Meetings were held regularly on the last Friday and Saturday of each month, from September to May, in rooms engaged for the purpose in the Bible House, New York. During the summer a longer session was usually held at New Haven or Andover. The opening session was on October 4, 1872, two and a third years after the British revisers had begun their work.

To devise a satisfactory method of coöperation between the British and American workers was not easy. In England the expenses involved in the undertaking were

borne by the university presses of Oxford and Cambridge. They, of course, expected to be reimbursed through the sale of the version when completed, and naturally they did not look with favor upon the idea of having a rival American edition in the field. Indeed it was in every way desirable that the labors of the two groups should issue in one version rather than two, but since distance made it impossible for them to meet together (not to mention other obstacles) the production of such a joint version was difficult of accomplishment. It was finally agreed that the British revisers would send to the Americans confidential copies of each portion of their successive revisions as that portion was completed. The Americans would examine these, compare them with their own studies and conclusions, and return them with such suggestions as they wished to make. Thus the work would proceed to the end, the Americans having the privilege of presenting, in an appendix to the published volume, such readings as had been rejected by the British revisers but were still preferred by them. The Americans in turn agreed not to publish an edition of their own for fourteen years, meanwhile giving their moral support to the editions published by the English university presses, that these might be favorably received in America.

The plan, as just sketched, was carried out, and thus it was that the Revised Version of 1881 (OT 1885) was produced. It was a joint British and American product, though British scholarship had taken the lead throughout. When the Revised Version is spoken of in Great Britain it is this version that is meant. It is also to be found in a good many American pulpits and homes. But the Revised Version most generally known and used in this country is a work published twenty years later, by Thomas Nelson & Sons, New York. Of it we have next to speak.

C. The American Standard New Testament (1901).

This is not, strictly speaking, an edition of the Revised Version of 1881, nor is it a distinct version. It is somewhere between the two. To call it a *recension* is perhaps most accurate. The earlier stage of its history is identical with the history of American participation in the making of the version of 1881, and has therefore already been sketched. It remains only that we should indicate what was done by the American revisers after their coöperation with their British associates had come to an end.

The American revisers kept up their organization, having in mind that after a lapse of time they would have the right—which might also involve a responsibility—to publish an edition of their own. An Appendix had been added to the edition of 1881, in accordance with the agreement referred to above, and in it the Americans had listed the most important of the readings preferred by them but not incorporated in the body of the work. It had seemed best, however, that the Appendix should be brief, so that in substance, as well as in form, it was a very inadequate expression of what was distinctive in the American revisers' work and point of view. Hence the plan to publish an independent American edition when the fourteen year limit should have expired. This would be in 1895 if only the New Testament were considered, but since the Old Testament part of the revision had not been issued until 1885 the agreement, as covering the work as a whole, might be thought to extend to 1899. The Americans allowed an ample margin since their edition did not appear until 1901.

As years passed the ranks of the New Testament company were sadly depleted. By 1895 only three of the thirteen active workers were still living. A particularly serious blow had been the death of Dr. Schaff in 1893. The three surviving members were Drs. Dwight, Thayer,

and Riddle, and upon these three devolved the labor of preparing the new American edition for the press. It was a heavy task, requiring nearly three years (1897-1900) for its accomplishment. The first step was to thoroughly review the work done prior to 1881. Full records of the earlier meetings had been kept, so that it was possible to base the new edition on the judgment of the entire original company, though the most of its members had meanwhile passed away. The readings listed in the Appendix of the edition of 1881, and a great many favored by the Americans but not in the Appendix were gone over again, use being made of criticisms and suggestions offered in the intervening years. Professor Thayer, with some assistance from his two associates, prepared a new set of marginal cross-references for the entire New Testament, a formidable undertaking in itself. New page headings were also prepared, while questions of paragraphing, punctuation, and spelling, not to mention proof-reading, required much labor and time. Finally, on August 26, 1901, the American Standard Version, as it came to be called, was placed on sale. It has been well received from the first, and for purposes of serious Bible study it may now be said to be, in truth, the "standard" version in America.

D. Comparison of the King James and Revised Versions.

The comparison will be confined to the New Testament. Some of the leading points of contrast between the Authorized Version and the Revised Version (in either of its forms) have already appeared. The foremost claim that has been made for the work of the British and American revisers has been that it is based on a better text than that which underlies the version of 1611 or any of its predecessors. Wyclif's and the Rheims versions were translations of a translation (the Latin

Vulgate). The others, however—that is, the Protestant versions from Tyndale down, including the Authorized Version—were based more or less directly on the Greek. But what this statement means is that they were based on one or more of the printed Greek Testaments then in use (Erasmus, the Complutensian, Stephen, Beza). And these, in turn, were based on only a few manuscripts, those most used being of late date and of the inferior "Syrian" type. This subject has been dealt with in Chapter II. The point is that between 1611 and 1881 the few manuscripts which New Testament scholars had studied had increased to hundreds, even thousands, while at the same time a scientific method of weighing the value of these sources had been evolved. Hence the difference between our Authorized Version and Revised Version—in the matter of their underlying text—is the difference between pre-scientific and scientific work. The former is by no means wholly bad, the latter by no means perfect, yet there is a great and vital difference.

The point on which we have just been dwelling is of particular importance to anyone who has in view careful study of the New Testament, or any part of it. It is mainly to its superiority in this matter of underlying text that the Revised Version owes its widespread adoption for classroom use. But for general use there is another feature which is perhaps of equal or greater importance: the changing of forms of expression, in English, which to the present-day reader either have no meaning or have a meaning different from that which the writer intended to convey. In most cases the obscurity, corrected in the Revised Version, is due to the fact that words and expressions often take on different usage as centuries roll by. In the English of to-day "we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not *prevent* them which are asleep" is meaningless. "Precede" is the modern English word (1 Thess. 4:15).

Again, in Romans 1:13 Paul is made to say that "oftentimes I purposed to come unto you (but was let hitherto) . . ." The word "let" now means almost the opposite of "hindered," which is the meaning here. Similar is the use of "by and by" for "immediately," as in Luke 21:9: "But when ye shall hear of wars and commotions, be not terrified: for these things must first come to pass; but the end is not by and by." When the author of 1 Peter speaks of the possibility that unbelieving husbands may "be won by the conversation of the wives" it is the wife's good *behavior,* not the edifying effect of what she says, that he has in mind (3:1). "Take no thought" for "be not anxious" (Matt. 6:25) is unfortunate, as is "usury" for "interest" (Matt. 25:27), "carriages" for "baggage" (Acts 21:15), "fetched a compass" for "made a circuit" (Acts 28:13), etc. Perhaps the examples cited are among the more extreme cases, yet certain it is that one who has accustomed himself to the language of the Revised Version and has occasion to turn from it to the "old" version is struck by the infelicitous expressions which confront him on nearly every page—infelicitous, that is, from the point of view of a correct understanding of what is meant.

If there is a third point of comparison worthy of being placed beside the two thus far listed it is to be found in the paragraph divisions which the revisers introduced. The chapter divisions found in all the familiar editions of the Bible seem to have been introduced originally (into the Latin Bible) by Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury, who died in 1228. The verse divisions appeared first in a Greek New Testament published by Robert Stephen in 1551. Both found their way into the English Bible. They were, and still are, useful for convenience of reference, but when each verse was set off as a separate unit, as in the Authorized Version, the result was unfortunate. It made a division of the subject mat-

ter which was mechanical and arbitrary, and in many cases a positive hindrance to the proper grasp of the writer's thought. The revisers retained the chapter and verse divisions for use in reference, but made them subordinate, dividing the matter rather in accordance with the natural divisions of the thought. It is a feature of their work which deserves the thanks of all who wish not only to have the Bible read but to have it understood.

To other changes we may devote but a word. The printing of poetic passages *as poetry,* not as prose, was an important gain. Much effort was devoted to correcting inaccuracies in the translation of the Greek article, tenses, and prepositions, and to a more uniform rendering of words that occurred frequently. In these particulars the work of the revisers shows not only a scholarship in advance of that of the makers of the Authorized Version but also a passion for accuracy in detail which is characteristic of the scientific age. However, they were not infallible. The nature of the Greek of the New Testament is a good deal better understood now than it was in their generation, and it is clear that their conclusions on grammatical points were sometimes based on mistaken premises.

The general literary merit or demerit of the Revised Version is still a moot question. Opinions on the subject are largely subjective and there is no final court of appeal. But certainly a careful examination does not bear out the view that the diction of the King James Version was drastically altered, and always for the worse. It was not drastically altered. The explicit aim of the revisers was to alter it as little as possible, and on the whole they adhered well to that aim. And the alterations were not always for the worse, from the literary point of view. The effort to achieve almost verbal literalness of rendering from the Greek undoubtedly did often stand in the way of felicitous English expression, yet the revisers

were by no means insensible to considerations of style, and moreover their high respect for the King James and other early versions served as a wholesome balance. When the worst is said the fact remains that in the Revised Version the conflicting demands of literal translation and idiomatic English expression are reconciled to a degree that is almost if not quite unparalleled. But literal translation is not necessarily the best translation, and idiomatic English changes considerably from generation to generation and century to century. Of this we shall have more to say in the next chapter.

As between the Revised Version of 1881 and the American Standard Version there are only minor differences on any of the above points. It may indeed be said that differences on other points as well are of minor character, but at any rate some of them are not without interest. In general, the cases in which the American revisers felt obliged to dissent from the judgment of their British brethren fall under three heads: (A) Cases where language was made to conform with American usage; *e.g.* "grain" for "corn" (see Mark 4:28), "labor" for "labour," etc. (B) Cases where the Americans felt more free than the British to alter words or expressions hallowed by time and associations; *e.g.* "who" for "which," as in the Lord's Prayer, "know" for "wot," "knew" for "wist," "drag" for "hale," "yet" for "howbeit," etc. But even the American Revised Version contains many obsolete terms. Under the same head may be classed the omission of "Saint" from the titles of the Gospels, the omission of Paul's name from the title of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the substitution of "Holy Spirit" for "Holy Ghost," etc. (C) Cases where the meaning of an expression was understood differently. In cases of uncertain meaning both groups of revisers followed the practice of placing the preferred reading in the text and the reading considered possible but less probable in the margin. Not infre-

quently the American revisers will be found to have placed the marginal reading of the version of 1881 in their text. Here as under the preceding head the greater conservatism of the British scholars made itself felt. Probably in a majority of the cases, though not in all, the weight of present-day scholarship on either side of the Atlantic would be found to favor the readings preferred by the Americans. "Very religious," substituted for "somewhat superstitious" in Acts 17:22, will serve as an example. On the whole it is in the recension of 1901 that we have the Revised Version in its best form—best for Americans, at least.

CHAPTER X

MODERN UNOFFICIAL TRANSLATIONS

A. Inadequacy of the "Official" Versions.

Of the three versions dealt with in the last chapter that of 1611 is much the most widely known and used. The other two, however, have definitely established themselves—the one in Great Britain and the other in America—and exert an influence that must be reckoned with. These three may be called "official" versions if the term is not understood in too strict a sense. They are official merely in the sense that they were produced by large and more or less representative groups of Protestant scholars, and have gained recognition as suitable for use in the pulpit and in church schools, as well as for private use—a recognition which other translations do not as a rule enjoy. Yet they have not been left in complete possession of the field. Beside them has arisen a considerable group of versions of a different character—the so-called "free" translations, some of which have attained wide circulation and no small prestige in recent years. This fact alone would indicate that the official versions, for some reason or reasons, have not approved themselves as entirely adequate.

It may be said with rough accuracy that there are three classes of actual or potential users of the New Testament: (1) Church people in general; (2) scholars and students; (3) the general public without church affiliations. That the classification is not rigid, nor the classes entirely exclusive of each other, is obvious enough.

With the first group the King James Version is overwhelmingly in the lead. It has two great points in its favor: its classical English and its sacred associations. To most of those in this group, especially the older people, no other version can really be the Bible, whatever merits it may have. Yet the very virtues of this version, for the use of this group, are defects when seen from a different point of view. The classical English, in many passages, is so far removed from the English of to-day that the meaning is obscure, while the sacred associations all too readily blind the reader to the thought which the writer wished to convey. On the whole it can scarcely be doubted that the dominance of this version among the rank and file of church people tends to foster and perpetuate a use of the Bible which is largely formal and which contributes very little to the realities of life.

The second group makes much larger use of the Revised Version, in one or other of its forms. In colleges, universities, and divinity schools its use is very general, and it has been widely introduced into the church schools. And its adoption, as over against the King James Version, is easily justified. One single feature will justify it: the fidelity of this version to the Greek. It is based on a greatly improved Greek text, and the translation of that text is remarkably literal. The great achievement of the revisers was to produce an almost word-for-word rendering of the Greek at a minimum sacrifice of felicity in English expression. But here again the merit involves a defect. It is altogether an error to assume that close translation of words and phrases is always the best means of accurately rendering ideas and thoughts. Sometimes a complete recasting of phraseology is necessary if thought is to be made clear. As a basis for careful study—particularly on the part of students unfamiliar with Greek—the Revised Version

has a real and important field of use, but those who thus use it need to realize the limitation which has just been pointed out.

The third group, the general public without church affiliations, makes slight use of the New Testament in any form. As a rule those belonging to this group know little of any Bible except the King James Version, and it is not likely to make a strong appeal to them. Comparatively few are drawn to it by its classical English, nor do sacred associations serve with many as a binding tie. What might be expected to attract is the human interest of the subject matter—its close touch with life. But here the antiquated English and the equally antiquated mechanical make-up (verse divisions, etc.) stand in the way. What these men and women have known of the Bible—or thought they have known—has not been such as to lead them to think of it as a book of human interest, and when they chance to look through a copy of the common version their previous opinion is probably confirmed. As for the Revised Version, its distinctive merit of being close to the Greek has little value here. One advantage it does have—its substitution of logical paragraphing for the entirely illogical verse divisions. Also, it removes the obscurities of the older version in some degree. But the introduction of these changes by the revisers was significant rather in what it suggested than in what it achieved. Room was left for much additional work toward presenting the New Testament as a living book.

All this does not mean that the King James and Revised versions are valueless. Far from it. There is no indication that they will be deprived of their semi-official prestige in our generation, and there is no need that they should be thus deprived. What it does mean is that notwithstanding the existence of these excellent versions, a field was left open for other translations of a different

character which should supplement them in important ways.

B. The Newer, Unofficial Translations.

Attempts to occupy the field have been rather numerous. Some, not without merit, we must pass by in silence; but of the modern unofficial translations six are of sufficient importance to justify their being listed here. They are the Twentieth Century (1898-1904), Weymouth's (1902), Moffatt's (1913), Ballantine's (1923), Goodspeed's (1923), and Mrs. Montgomery's (1924). The two oldest on the list have had honorable careers of usefulness, but neither has wide use or great prestige at the present time. The case with Moffatt's translation is different. During the decade following its appearance it gained steadily in the esteem of Bible users on both sides of the Atlantic, so that when in 1923 and 1924 three new versions were put forth—all of them American products—Moffatt's was the one outstanding rival in the field.

The most notable changes to be seen in these independent translations, as compared with the official versions, may be classed under four heads: (1) Changes in mechanical make-up; (2) changes due to the progress of studies in the Greek New Testament; (3) changes due to the use of English like that of our present, everyday speech; (4) changes looking to the better rendering of thought, especially through the freer rendering of words. We shall proceed to illustrate these points in turn.

C. Changes in Mechanical Make-up.

Here considerable difference appears. The Twentieth Century New Testament abandons the traditional order of the books in favor of an order more nearly chronological. Thus Mark appears as the first of the Gospels, while 1 and 2 Thessalonians have first place among the

letters of Paul. But in all of the other five translations the familiar order is preserved. Topic headings are used in the Twentieth Century, Weymouth's and Montgomery's, but not in the other three. In conversational matter the Twentieth Century, Moffatt's, Goodspeed's and Montgomery's follow the practice, usual in modern books and newspapers, of giving a separate paragraph to each unit of conversation, however small. Ballantine, on the other hand, has longer paragraphs, his work resembling the Revised Version in this respect. Moffatt's practice has the appearance of a compromise between the two. All six translators use quotation marks, a departure from the precedent set by the official versions. Only occasionally, as in John 3, and Galatians 2, does difference of opinion manifest itself as to how much the quotation marks should embrace. A peculiarity of Moffatt's work is the rearrangement, here and there, of matter which the translator believed to have been misplaced. Thus in John, Chapters 15 and 16 are "restored to their original position" in the middle of 13:31. But none of the three more recent versions follows Moffatt's in these rearrangements of the text.

In the Goodspeed translation it has been made a matter of particular concern to give to the New Testament the appearance of a book to be "continuously and understandingly read." Ballantine has evidently had a similar principle in mind. He has omitted verse numbers entirely, while in one edition of his work Goodspeed merely notes the chapter and verse content of each page in small numbers at the foot of the page. Thus in these versions the revolt against the old divisions has gone almost as far as it can go.

Lest anyone should imagine that this idea of chapter and verse divisions being a handicap is of recent origin I venture to quote a few sentences from John Locke's "Essay for the Understanding of St. Paul's Epistles by

Consulting St. Paul Himself." (Locke died in 1704. The essay serves as a preface to his *Paraphrase.*)

> The dividing of them into Chapters and Verses, as we have done, whereby they are so chop'd and minc'd, and as they are now Printed, stand so broken and divided, that not only the Common People take the Verses usually for distinct Aphorisms, but even Men of more advanc'd Knowledge in reading them, lose very much of the strength and force of the Coherence, and the Light that depends on it. . . . These Divisions also have given occasion to the reading these Epistles by parcels and in scraps, which has farther confirm'd the Evil arising from such partitions. And I doubt not but every one will confess it to be a very unlikely way to come to the Understanding of any other Letters to read them Piecemeal, a Bit to-day, and another Scrap to-morrow, and so on by broken Intervals. . . . How plain soever this Abuse is, and what Prejudice soever it does to the Understanding of the Sacred Scripture, yet if a Bible was printed as it should be, and as the several parts of it were writ, in continued Discourses where the Argument is continued, I doubt not but the several Parties would complain of it, as an Innovation, and a dangerous Change in the publishing those holy Books. . . . They would most of them be immediately disarm'd of their great Magazine of Artillery wherewith they defend themselves, and fall upon others, if the Holy Scripture were but laid before the Eyes of Christians in its due Connection and Consistency. . . .

Nothing more needs to be said, except to note that in two and a quarter centuries Locke's view has made some slight headway.

D. Changes Due to the Progress of Studies in the Greek New Testament.

Changes under this head are not numerous, comparatively, nor of surpassing importance. Goodspeed has closely followed the Greek text of Westcott and Hort. He has departed from it in six instances, cited in his Preface, but none of them affects the translation in an important way. Ballantine has used the Nestle text, which differs only in minor particulars from that of Westcott and Hort. Moffatt based his translation primarily on the Von Soden text, but not seldom he has departed from it and adopted the Westcott and Hort reading. In short, the Greek New Testament which underlies all these recent English versions is that which the science of textual criticism, after centuries of painstaking labor, has given us. It is now a standardized text, relatively speaking, there being few variations which affect the sense in other than minor ways. Also, it is the same text which underlies the Revised Version (though not the King James Version), so that the appearance of these unofficial translations is not to be justified on the ground that they represent a radically improved Greek text. In the Goodspeed translation there is one instance, and perhaps only one, in which an altered Greek reading has had an important effect on the sense of a passage. The passage is 1 Peter 3:19. Here Professor Goodspeed has adopted the suggestion of Rendel Harris—adopted also by Moffatt, though not by Ballantine or Montgomery—that through a scribe's blunder the name of Enoch has dropped out of the text. It was Enoch, then, not Christ, who "went and preached even to those spirits that were in prison," the reference being to a story in the Book of Enoch (Chapters 6ff.). The case for this alteration of the text is unusually convincing, and its adoption clears up the passage remarkably.

Recent progress in the study of the Greek New Testa-

ment has been along lexical and grammatical, more than text-critical, lines. The work of Deissmann, Moulton, Milligan, Robertson, and others has been largely popularized and it is to be expected that the new translations should embody some of the results of labors in this field. And they do, though here again disappointment is in store for anyone who expects the changes to be numerous or radical. Usage in the papyri makes it all but certain that the idea of "laziness" should be substituted for that of "disorderliness" in 2 Thessalonians 3:6-15. It has become equally clear that the word which the Revised Version renders "both," in Acts 19:16 and 23:8, not only may mean, but here does mean, "all." Moffatt and Goodspeed have made the required change in each case. Ballantine has not. Mrs. Montgomery has made partial changes. In these and a few other passages lexical studies have yielded results which affect translation in more or less important degree. But the total is not large.

In the rendering of the article and the tenses, especially the aorist tense, there was much room for improvement on the official versions. The King James translators did not consistently follow any principle, while the revisers did consistently follow principles that were wrong. They acted on the principle that the Greek aorist should be rendered by the English simple past whenever possible, and that where the article is used in the Greek it should be used also in the English if our idiom will tolerate it. As a matter of fact the Greek aorist often requires to be rendered with the so-called perfect tense in English, while often, especially in the case of abstract nouns, the Greek article should not be rendered into English at all. Happily, the more recent translators have had a clearer understanding of these matters.

Much more might be said on this phase of the subject,

but when all is said the total of the "new light" on the Greek New Testament, as affecting translation or other practical interests, is not so very great. In some popular works on the Bible archeological and other discoveries have been "played up" so as to yield an impression that is entirely erroneous. It is not mainly on this ground that the appearance of the new translations is to be justified.

E. Changes Due to the Use of English Like That of Our Present Everyday Speech.

Here the changes are much more numerous. In Mark 15:25 "the third hour" becomes "nine in the morning," alike in Moffatt's translation, in Goodspeed's, and in Ballantine's. Mrs. Montgomery has "nine o'clock in the morning." So also "an issue of blood" becomes "a hemorrhage" (Matt. 9:20); "publicans" become "tax-gatherers" or "tax collectors" (Matt. 9:10), etc. But the changes are by no means always so uniform. The following list of renderings, selected more or less at random, will perhaps prove useful in forming an estimate of the comparative character of these four recent translations:

Matt. 1:18—"His mother Mary was betrothed to Joseph" (Moffatt); "His mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph" (Ballantine); "Mary, his mother, was engaged to Joseph" (Goodspeed); "After his mother, Mary, had been betrothed to Joseph" (Montgomery).

Matt. 3:4—"a leather girdle round his loins" (Moffatt); "a leather belt around his waist" (Ballantine, Goodspeed, Montgomery).

Matt. 3:7—"You brood of vipers" (Moffatt); "Brood of vipers" (Ballantine); "You brood of snakes" (Goodspeed); "O brood of vipers" (Montgomery).

Matt: 4:11—"angels came up and ministered to him" (Moffatt); "angels came and waited upon him" (Ballantine); "angels came and waited on him" (Goodspeed); "angels came and ministered to him" (Montgomery).

Matt. 6:14—"For if you forgive men their trespasses" (Moffatt); "For if you forgive men their wrong-doings" (Ballantine); "For if you forgive others when they offend you" (Goodspeed); "For if you forgive men their offenses against you" (Montgomery).

Matt. 6:24—"You cannot serve both God and Mammon" (Moffatt); "You cannot serve God and Mammon" (Ballantine); "You cannot serve God and money" (Goodspeed); "You cannot be the slaves both of God and of gold" (Montgomery).

Matt. 7:1—"Judge not that you may not be judged yourselves" (Moffatt); "Do not judge, so that you may not be judged" (Ballantine); "Pass no more judgments upon other people, so that you may not have judgments passed upon you" (Goodspeed); "Judge not, that you may not be judged, yourselves" (Montgomery).

Matt. 7:6—"do not throw pearls before swine" (Moffatt); "nor cast your pearls before swine" (Ballantine, Montgomery); "do not throw your pearls before pigs" (Goodspeed).

Matt. 7:10—"Or, if he asks a fish, will you hand him a serpent" (Moffatt); "Or if he asks for a fish will give him a serpent?" (Ballantine); "Or if he asks for a fish, will he give him a snake" (Goodspeed); "or if his son asks for a fish, will offer him a snake" (Montgomery).

Mark 2:3—"a paralytic . . . four men carried him" (Moffatt); "a paralytic, borne by four" (Ballantine); "a man who was paralyzed, four of them

carrying him" (Goodspeed); "a paralytic, carried by four men" (Montgomery).

Mark 6:11—"as a testimony against them" (Ballantine); "as a warning to them" (Moffatt, Goodspeed, Montgomery).

John 14:2—"In my father's house there are many abodes" (Moffatt); "In my Father's house are many abiding places" (Ballantine); "There are many rooms in my Father's house" (Goodspeed); "In my Father's house there are many rooms" (Montgomery).

Rom. 1:7—"called to be saints" (Moffatt, Montgomery); "called to be holy" (Ballantine); "called to be his people" (Goodspeed).

Gal. 5:13—"do not make your freedom an opening for the flesh" (Moffatt); "do not let your freedom be an opportunity for the flesh" (Ballantine); "do not make your freedom an excuse for the physical" (Goodspeed); "do not make your freedom an excuse for self-indulgence" (Montgomery).

2 Peter 3:1, 8, 14, 17—"beloved" (Moffatt, Ballantine, Montgomery); "dear friends" (Goodspeed).

It would seem that in this matter of rendering the New Testament into the English of to-day Goodspeed has gone rather farther than any of the other three. His rendering "God's people" instead of "saints," as in Rom. 1:7 and elsewhere, is a particularly good illustration of the value of changing a traditional term into one in current use. Our word "saints" has acquired associations which make it misleading and entirely unsuitable. Ballantine's "holy" is literal, but it fails to reproduce the New Testament sense of the Greek word as "God's people" does. A less happy change is Goodspeed's "heathen" for "Gentiles." Probably it conveys about the right idea in such a passage as Matt. 6:32: "For after all these

things do the Gentiles seek," but a case like Rom. 1:13 is different: "I want you to understand, brothers, that I have often intended to come to see you (though thus far I have been prevented) in order to produce some results among you, as well as among the rest of the heathen." So Goodspeed renders. But it doesn't seem quite like Paul to call non-Jewish Christians "heathen," and it doesn't seem quite natural that anyone should call the same people "brothers" and "heathen" in the same sentence.

The varying extent to which the "thee" and "thou" diction is retained is a point of interest. Goodspeed alone rules it out entirely. Mrs. Montgomery retains it in prayers, as in the Lord's Prayer and in John 17, and in quotations from the Old Testament. Moffatt retains it in prayers and apparently nowhere else. Ballantine's use of the old forms is not confined to prayers, but it is not clear just where he draws the line.

Naturally, the American translators sometimes agree, as against Moffatt, in discarding forms of expression which are in common use in Great Britain but not in America. Moffatt's "ears of corn," in Matt. 12:1, becomes "heads of grain" (Ballantine), "heads of wheat" (Goodspeed), or "ears of wheat" (Montgomery). On the American side of the Atlantic "ears of corn" could mean only Indian corn. For "farthing," as in Matt. 10:29, Ballantine has "penny," Goodspeed "cent." The latter is more strictly American. Mrs. Montgomery, it is curious to note, has "half-penny." Another departure from Moffatt's diction for which American readers should be grateful is to be seen in the use, or rather non-use, of "got." "Jesus . . . got baptized in the Jordan by John" (Mark 1:9, Moffatt) will serve as an example. The American translators all have "was baptized."

It will be seen that while these recent translations differ greatly among themselves all of them go much farther

than the Revised Version in the effort to render the New Testament into the English of our own rather than Shakespeare's time. Neither the British nor the American revisers modernized the English of the Bible, except in slight degree, or had any intention of doing so. We have seen that they often introduced changes in words and forms of expression—the Americans more often than the British—and that this was one of the important features of their work. But the end in view was not at all the modernizing of the language. On the contrary, the explicit aim was to retain the familiar style and diction as far as possible, making changes only when demanded for the correction of inaccuracies or the removal of obscurities. The language of the Revised Version remains essentially the English of the seventeenth century, with considerable elements that go even farther back. Probably the revisers acted wisely in following this course, but it is well that through the labors of others we have the Bible also in modern dress. It is an unfortunate fact that to multitudes of the men and women of to-day the Scriptures in their old form have no attraction, and to some of these the new translations are serving as a doorway to treasures that would otherwise have been unknown.

F. Changes Looking to the Better Rendering of Thought, Especially Through the Freer Rendering of Words.

Here also the changes are numerous. And they are the most important of all. The greatest service which these translators have rendered has been in the attention which they have given to the representation of thought as over against the mere translation of words.

Mark 12:10 will serve as an example: "The stone which the builders rejected, the same was made the head of the corner" (R. V.). But one finds it a little hard to

visualize a stone so placed as to be "the head of the corner." Only in such a rendering as "the chief stone of the corner" (Ballantine) or simply "the cornerstone" (Goodspeed) does the sense of the expression become clear.

The evolution of such a passage as John 2:17, in the hands of our translators, is interesting to observe. "And his disciples remembered that it was written, The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up." This is the familiar King James reading. It is with the latter part of the verse, taken from Ps. 69:9, that we are now concerned. In other translations we find it as follows: "The zeal of thine house sholl eat me up" (R. V. of 1881); "Zeal for thy house shall eat me up" (A. R. V.); "Zeal for thy house will devour me" (Ballantine); "My zeal for your house will consume me" (Goodspeed). This is one case where the American revisers, though not the British, modified their customary literalness in the interest of common sense. Only a very moderate familiarity with Greek syntax is needed to make it clear that "the zeal" in Greek should be simply "zeal" in English, and that "of thine house" is an objective genitive. The senseless rendering given in the earlier versions must be attributed to a false principle of translation rather than to ignorance of Greek usage. If the American revisers had done as well elsewhere as they have done here in the matter of rendering the sense rather than merely the words, there would have been much less need of their work being supplemented by such translations as we are now considering.

Unfortunately they did not always do so well. How badly they could do is demonstrated in such a passage as Gal. 3:2-4, where Paul is made to address the "foolish Galatians" in language that matches their foolishness. "This only would I learn from you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now

perfected in the flesh? Did ye suffer so many things in vain? if it be indeed in vain?" "The hearing of faith" is as good an example as one could wish for of an exactly literal translation which is as meaningless as it is literal. "The works of the law" is of the same order, though not as bad. "Are ye now perfected" misses the point entirely, while "did ye" reveals a mistaken view as to the rendering of the Greek aorist. "Suffer," almost certainly, is also wrong. The revisers, however, did not originate these infelicities, with the single exception of "did ye" for "have ye." The others they merely took over from the King James Version and helped to perpetuate. We may now turn to Goodspeed's rendering. "You senseless Galatians! . . . This is all I want to ask you: Did you receive the Spirit through doing what the Law commands, or through believing the message you heard? Are you so senseless? Did you begin with the Spirit only to end now with the flesh? Have you gone through so much, all for nothing?—if it really is for nothing!" This gets us very much nearer to what Paul meant to say.

Does the rendering of thought, if it is to be adequate, involve the removal of ambiguities in the original—the making clear of that which the writer himself has not made clear? There is room for difference of opinion on this point. It is well to remember that a translator is *ipso facto* an interpreter in any case. He cannot avoid it though he tries. But whether he tries or not, or how hard he tries, will greatly affect the character of his work. The King James translators, generally speaking, meant to avoid interpretation, but the revisers meant it with greater earnestness and with more exactness of scholarship. As a rule they did not attempt to remove ambiguities. To do so would have been interpreting—interposing their own ideas between the writer and his readers—and this they did not under-

stand to be part of their task. The free translators, on the other hand, take a different view. They do not always succeed in removing ambiguities, but they usually try. The reader expects, and has a right to expect, that they will do so. The amount and quality of the interpretation which their work embodies will largely determine its value and its permanence.

We may take an illustration from James 5:16: "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much" (A. V.). When we are praising the English of the King James Version we conveniently forget examples such as this. To say that an "effectual" prayer "availeth much" seems like a needless waste of words. The writer of James was a man with a large fund of common sense, and it is a safe surmise that what he wrote here was meant to have a more definite meaning than our English conveys. The Revised Version, in both its forms, has "The supplication of a righteous man availeth much in its working"—a more literal rendering which is also rather more hopeless as far as intelligibility is concerned. Ballantine's "The effective prayer of a righteous man has great power" goes back, essentially, to the King James rendering. The other modern translators wrestle with the sentence with varying degrees of success. Goodspeed gives us "an upright man can do a great deal by prayer *when he tries*" (italics supplied.) Is this what the writer meant? Possibly. At any rate the translator has put into simple and unambiguous English what he thinks the writer meant.

Another passage where interpretation is difficult is 1 Cor. 7:36-38. Here it is interesting to note that neither Moffatt, Ballantine, nor Goodspeed supports the Revised Version—followed by Weymouth and the Twentieth Century—in the attempt to make a "virgin *daughter*" of the young woman whose hypothetical case Paul cites. Moffatt makes her a "spiritual bride";

Goodspeed "the girl to whom he is engaged"; Ballantine's "his virgin" points, though vaguely, in the same direction, falling back on the literal and colorless King James rendering. In any case it may be assumed that the "virgin daughter" idea has had its day, notwithstanding the fact that Mrs. Montgomery reproduces it.

G. Conclusion.

Do these newer translations provide the needed supplement to the official versions? It would seem that in a large and creditable measure they do. If it is true that the man who has known and cared little about the New Testament can be led to interest himself in it through having it made available in the form of a book meant to be read, and in language like that of the everyday speech of cultured men, then the appearance of these works should substantially increase the number of those who know the New Testament. And if it is possible for hardened Bible readers to be shocked out of their conception of the New Testament as a codification of doctrinal and ethical precepts, and be made to see it as a collection of writings which throb with the developing life of primitive Christianity, this also such translations should be capable of accomplishing.

But it may be questioned whether great permanent results are to be expected through either of these lines of influence. It is doubtful if Bible reading by the general public—apart from the sound interpretation and sane application which only good scholarship can guarantee, and apart also from the influence of the church and other educative and inspirational agencies—will ever in the future yield very great results in the improvement of the world's religious and moral life. The task of uplifting and saving humanity is not so simple as that. It may be conjectured, then, that these modern translations will yield their greatest harvest of influence through

their use by the student class. As condensed practical commentaries they are invaluable, and, happily, serious students of the New Testament are making large use of them.

PART III

THE BACKGROUND OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER XI

THE HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL BACKGROUND

In previous chapters we have sketched the situations and circumstances which brought about the rise of early Christian literature, and have tried to picture the process by which portions of this litertature came to be regarded as a new Scripture by the Christian church. It is now necessary as a preliminary to the study of the literary, historical, and religious matter which the New Testament has to offer us that we look at the larger background out of which these writings grew.

A. Palestine Under the Ptolemies, the Seleucids, and the Maccabees.

The student of Old Testament history will remember how the Hebrew people, having lost their independence and many of their number having been taken as captives to distant lands, were first under Assyrian and Babylonian and later under Persian control. It was in the period of Persian rule that some of the exiles returned and the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the Temple occurred. The leaders in this work of restoration were Ezra and Nehemiah, and considerable information as to their work can be gathered from the Old Testament books which bear their names. From this time until the appearance on the scene of Alexander the Great, a period of just about a century, our knowledge of Jewish history is nearly blank. Alexander defeated the Persians at Issus in 333 B. C., and within a few years made himself

master of the entire eastern Mediterranean world. The Jews seem to have submitted without resistance and to have been treated with favor by the conqueror. After Alexander's death (323 B. C.) and the partition of his empire which followed, the Jews found their country in the position of a buffer state between the kingdom of the Ptolemies in Egypt and that of the Seleucids in Syria. For a century and a quarter they were mainly under Egyptian control, but at the battle of Banias, in 198 B. C., the Seleucid ruler Antiochus III gained possession of Palestine. The Syrian overlordship continued from this date until it was challenged by Mattathias, the founder of the Maccabean line of Jewish leaders, in 168 B. C.

The Jewish revolt which made the name of the Maccabees immortal grew out of the attempt of the Syrian king Antiochus IV, surnamed Epiphanes, to blot out the distinctive national customs of the Jews. He was trying what rulers in both ancient and modern times have often tried, to consolidate and strengthen his realm by crushing whatever tended to keep alive the spirit of separate nationalism in a racial group included within that realm. Bitter persecution was suffered by loyal Jews. The practice of circumcision and the keeping of the Sabbath were punished with death. The king's officers went through the land to see that his orders were obeyed and that the people sacrificed to the heathen gods. It was from the village of Modin that the flames of revolt first spread. Here Mattathias, an aged priest, and his sons slew one of the royal officers and a renegade Jew who was attempting to offer heathen sacrifice. They then escaped to the mountains and rallied around themselves a rebel band. The old priest soon died, but under the leadership of his son and successor Judas the revolt was carried on with such success that within a few years a series of crushing defeats had been visited upon the Syrians and in 164 B. C. the Jews were granted the right to live in accordance

with their own laws. But the struggle was by no means at an end. Judas was succeeded by his brother Jonathan, and he in turn by Simon, another of the sons of Mattathias. Others of the line—John Hyrcanus, Aristobulus, Alexander Jannaeus, Alexandra, Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II—held the leadership until Palestine passed into the hands of the Romans in 63 B. C.

The Maccabean period thus lasted approximately a century. It was a period of almost continuous strife, made the more bitter by the fact that many Jews, particularly the wealthier and more aristocratic class, sympathized with and aided the attempt to break down the exclusiveness of their countrymen and have them adopt the Greek civilization which had so largely permeated the life of the Mediterranean world. This, in general, was the position of the Sadducees. The Pharisees, on the other hand, stood for strict adherence to the Jewish Law, and for the keeping up of the barrier between Jews and non-Jews which the Law and the scribal interpretations of the Law prescribed. These two parties, familiar to readers of the New Testament, seem to have had their origin in the time of the Maccabees. The Pharisees had much the larger popular following.

B. The Romans and the Herods.

According to legend the city of Rome was founded in 753 B. C., a few years before Isaiah received his call to be a prophet of God. The wars which finally resulted in the city becoming the mistress of all Italy extended over the period 509-275 B. C. There followed the conquest of other lands surrounding the Mediterranean, Roman authority in this vast region being thoroughly established by 133 B. C. Revolts broke out, however, from time to time. The most serious of these was led by Mithridates, king of Pontus, who fought three successive wars with the Romans before he was finally subdued by

Pompey in 66 B. C. The Roman general, victorious over Mithridates, next turned southward into Syria, where he was met by envoys from Jerusalem. It is at this point that the direct interference of Rome in the affairs of Palestine begins.

Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II, whose names close the list of Maccabean rulers given above, were brothers and rival claimants to the succession when their mother Alexandra died. Civil war resulted, and when Pompey appeared in Syria each of the rival factions appealed to him to support its cause. The Roman deferred his decision until he would have leisure to visit Palestine in person, and meanwhile ordered both brothers to keep the peace. Aristobulus, however, defied him and showed himself so treacherous that Pompey finally besieged him in Jerusalem and captured the city after three months, carrying off Aristobulus and many other Jews as captives to Rome. Hyrcanus II was left as high priest, the political control being mainly in the hands of the Roman governor of Syria.

Hyrcanus II was a man of little strength of character, but he had a self-appointed adviser, named Antipater, who possessed in abundance the energy and ambition which Hyrcanus lacked. This Antipater apparently was not a Jew, but belonged to a related race, the Idumeans (Edomites), whose territory lay south of Judaea. He was an opportunist and a shrewd diplomatist, and he did not fail to make the most of the opportunities which the Roman occupation gave to him. He made himself useful to Pompey and his subordinates until that general was overthrown by Julius Caesar (48 B. C.), when he quickly changed front and won the friendship of Caesar by the same policy. Caesar made him the representative of Rome in Palestine, with the rank of procurator, while his two sons, Phasaelus and Herod, were placed in control of the Jerusalem district and of Galilee respectively.

Antipater was murdered in 43 B. C., and three years later Phasaelus killed himself after having been captured by invading Parthians. Herod escaped from the invaders, went to Rome, had himself appointed king of the Jews, came back and in three or four years of fighting gained control of the kingdom which had been given to him.

This first of the Herods is known to history as Herod the Great. His long reign (40-4 B. C.) was occupied with extending the borders of his kingdom and consolidating it, with great building operations, and with fostering Greek culture in his realm. On the whole he respected Jewish religious customs, and internal affairs were ably administered. The country enjoyed unusual peace and prosperity. His rule was probably fairly popular until the later years of his reign. Then he was harassed by family troubles and seems to have become unbalanced mentally. His favorite wife Mariamne and her mother Alexandra, who were of the line of the Maccabees, were executed in 28 B. C. Later in his reign numerous other suspects fell victims to his madness, including several of his sons. One of his last acts was to bring about the death of his son Antipater, and he is said to have given orders that at his death the most distinguished men of the nation, whom he had caused to be shut up in the arena at Jericho, should be put to death, so that there might be great mourning when he passed away. It is this Herod who appears in the New Testament in the second chapter of Matthew, in the story of the "Wise Men" and the murder of the children at Bethlehem.

Herod's will, ratified by Augustus, the Roman emperor, divided his kingdom among three of his sons. The political status of Palestine, with some adjacent territory, from 4 B. C. to 44 A. D., may be briefly indicated as follows:

(a) Judaea—under Archelaus from 4 B. C. to 6 A. D.; under Roman governors, called procurators, from 6 to 41

A. D.; under Herod Agrippa I, grandson of Herod the Great, from 41 to 44 A. D. Archelaus was removed for incompetence. Following him were seven successive procurators. Little is known of any of them except Pontius Pilate, who held office from 26 to 36 A. D. The two eminent Jewish writers Josephus and Philo agree in giving him a bad name. His stubbornness and bravado found expression in various clashes with the Jews. Yet it is to be remembered that the Jews were very hard to govern. If Pilate had been entirely incompetent he would probably have been removed from office before the expiration of ten years. Tiberias, who was then emperor, was not lax in his oversight of the provinces. The role played by Pilate in the New Testament, in the accounts of the trial and death of Jesus, is well known.

(b) Galilee and Perea—under Herod Antipas from 4 B. C. to 39 A. D.; under Herod Agrippa I from 39 to 44 A. D. Herod Antipas ruled during the lifetime of Jesus and is referred to a number of times in the New Testament (see Mark 6:14-29; Matt. 14:1-12; Luke 3:19-20 and 9:7-9; Luke 23:6-15; cf. Mark 8:15; Luke 8:3; 13: 31-32; Acts 4:27; 13.1). His rank was that of tetrarch, though Mark (6:14) calls him king. He inherited his father's fondness for great building enterprises. He rebuilt the important Galilean city of Sepphoris, of which the village of Nazareth was a suburb. It had been partly destroyed during an insurrection some years previous. On the western shore of the Sea of Galilee he founded a new city, named, in honor of the emperor, Tiberias. That he was a true Herod appeared also in other less commendable activities. The Gospels tell of his bringing about the execution of John the Baptist at the instigation of Herodias. He seems also to have planned to put Jesus out of the way by craft (see Luke 13:31-32). From Josephus we learn that his marriage with Herodias was his undoing. It led to war with the

king of Arabia, father of the former wife whom he divorced. Antipas was defeated, and moreover the armament accumulated for this war aroused the suspicion of the emporer and led to his deposition and banishment.

(c) Northeastern districts (Batanea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, Gaulinitis, Panias, Iturea)—under Philip from 4 B. C. to 34 A. D.; incorporated in the province of Syria from 34 to 37 A. D.; under Herod Agrippa I from 37 to 44 A. D. This was a heterogeneous territory, composed of districts which had been conquered by one or other of the Jewish rulers or given to them by the Romans. Josephus pictures Philip as a wise and benevolent ruler, much the best of the Herods from the standpoint of character. His career has but little contact with the New Testament. The city of Caesarea Philippi, referred to in Mark 8:27 and Matt. 16:13, bears his name, having been founded by him at the source of the Jordan, on the site of the ancient Panias. He was the husband of Salome, daughter of Herodias. Apparently it was another of the sons of Herod the Great, not Philip (as in Mark 6:17; Matt. 14:3) who was the former husband of Herodias.

Herod Agrippa I is the Herod who appears in the twelfth chapter of Acts. His was an adventurous career. At the age of forty he was a fugitive from his creditors and on the point of committing suicide. But thanks to his ability to get on the good side of the emperors his fortunes soon changed. First the former territories of Philip were given to him, with the title of king. Next, when Antipas was deposed, his tetrarchy of Galilee and Perea was added to Agrippa's realm. Finally, when Claudius became emperor in 41 A. D., Judaea was also placed under Agrippa's control, so that during the closing years of his life his kingdom was practically as great in extent as that of his grandfather Herod the Great had been. He followed the usual policy of the Herods in

that while being fond of the Graeco-Roman culture and amusements he tried to keep in favor with the Jews (cf. Acts 12:1-3). Josephus has an account of his death, at Caesarea, which is considerably fuller than that of Acts. In our own time it has been conjectured that he died of appendicitis. His age was fifty-four.

Herod Agrippa II, son of Herod Agrippa I, is also met with in the New Testament. He was only seventeen when his father died, and Claudius was dissuaded from appointing him successor to the throne. Later he was given the little kingdom of Chalcis, and still later this was exchanged for the former tetrarchy of Philip with some added territory (53 A. D.). Throughout this period he also had the oversight of the Temple in Jerusalem, with the power of appointing the high priest. Such was his official status at the time of his visit to Caesarea, as narrated in Acts 25:13ff. He lived a good deal of the time in Rome and Jerusalem, as well as in his kingdom. What we know of his private life is little to his credit, and it is very unlikely that his remark to Paul, quoted in Acts 26:28, is to be interpreted as indicating a sincere disposition to become a convert to Christianity (cf. R. V., and more recent translations, with A. V.). He seems to have lived until about 100 A. D.

C. The Roman System of Provincial Government.

It may be well at this point to say a word about the Roman method of governing the lands and peoples of which their vast empire was composed. A very important feature of their method—perhaps its most important feature—was its flexibility. It was not felt to be at all necessary that the government of all the outlying territories should be uniform. In general local laws and customs were interfered with as little as possible. The existing order of things was changed only in so far as seemed to be required for the maintenance of peace and

the safeguarding of Roman interests. Sometimes, as in the case of the Herods, a local ruler was left in control, with the title of ethnarch, tetrarch, or even king. But a nation thus ruled was just as subject to Rome as if a Roman governor were placed over it. We have seen that Herod the Great at his death bequeathed his realm to three of his sons, as an independent ruler might have done. But Herod's will was in reality nothing more than a recommendation to the Roman emperor, which that ruler saw fit to have carried out. When one of these sons in a few years proved himself incompetent he was removed and his place taken by a Roman governor.

Where a governor was in charge he bore the title of "proconsul" if the province was "senatorial," "legate," or "propraetor," if it was "imperial." Senatorial provinces were under the control of the Roman senate, the proconsul as a rule holding office only a single year. The revenues went into the senatorial treasury. Imperial provinces were under the emperor's control, the legate holding office for an indefinite period, usually several years, and the revenues finding their way into the imperial treasury. The latter type of government was more conducive to efficiency and was usually found in territories which had a reputation for being turbulent. The "procurators," whom we have already met with and will meet with again, were agents of the emperor, like the legates and propraetors, differing from them in being of lower rank and usually ruling smaller territories. Judaea was an imperial province ruled by a procurator—when it was not under a local ruler or attached to the larger province of Syria. (In Acts 13:7 is a reference to the proconsul of Cyprus, Segius Paulus; and in Acts 18:12 a reference to Gallio, proconsul of Achaia. Both Cyprus and Achaia were senatorial provinces at this time).

As has already been intimiated Roman rule was tolerant in principle, though in practice sometimes harsh.

Taxes of various sorts—poll-tax, land-tax, customs dues, etc.—were levied, but probably these did not press heavily upon the average man. The system of collecting taxes was much less objectionable in New Testament times than it had been earlier. In this as in many other respects government under the Empire was more just and more efficient than government under the republic had been. In large measure the system of "farming out" the taxes to middlemen had been done away with, and where it was still retained the middlemen were now natives rather than collectors sent out to the provinces from Italy. It is evident that Matthew and Zacchaeus, for example—of the tax collectors mentioned in the New Testament—were Jews. No doubt cases of extortion were frequent enough (cf. Luke 3:12-13). But the unpopularity of the "publicans," reflected so clearly in the New Testament, seems to have been due mainly to the deep-rooted sense, on the part of the Jews, of being Jehovah's chosen people and owing "tribute" to him alone (cf. Mark 12:14-15).

In its military aspect, again, Roman rule in the provinces was much less oppressive than it might have been. Garrisons were maintained where there was felt to be need of them, the number of troops varying with the local situation. The normal force in Judaea consisted of a single cohort of the regular army, the "Italian band" referred to in Acts 10:1, together with four or five cohorts of infantry and a troop of cavalry recruited locally. These latter, however, were recruited from non-Jews. Jews were exempt from service, probably because their Scripture, as interpreted by the rabbis, forbade them to carry arms on the Sabbath day. This was one of many respects in which Rome showed herself tolerant toward Jewish peculiarities. But in any case the provincials who served in the Roman armies were usually volunteers. Only in emergencies, or for special reasons,

was service made compulsory. The Roman force in a province did police duty when and where local provision was inadequate. Probably in most parts of the empire life and property were more secure than they have ever been in the same regions since. In Palestine the spirit of violence and insurrection was strong, and the small garrison must have had plenty of activity. Much larger forces were maintained in the adjoining province of Syria, and these could be called upon for aid when the situation became more than usually serious.

In the administration of justice, as in other departments of administration, the Roman policy was to allow large sway to the local machinery. The attitude of Gallio, who "cared for none of these things," was typical. As proconsul of the province he was "not minded to be a judge" in matters of minor import. The provincial governors were judicial as well as executive officers, as the New Testament reveals in the cases of Pilate, Felix, and Festus, but as a rule they confined their attention to the more important cases—as those appealed from the lower courts, or those in which a Roman citizen was involved.

In general it may be said that Roman provincial government in New Testament times was as enlightened as could reasonably be expected. There were doubtless features which would seem intolerable to us, but the majority of Rome's subjects were used to things much worse. The great service of the Empire was in bringing to the Mediterranean world such order and stability as it had not before known. If the Romans did not always keep before them the ideal of governing in the interest of the governed we may well regret the fact, but citizens of one of the modern world-powers are not in a good position to throw stones. Probably Great Britain and the United States have done better in this respect than Rome did, but we have still a long way to go. With

Rome, as with us, the problem was in large measure one of official personnel. A wise and broad-minded governor could achieve wonders, whereas a shallow and bigoted official could do immeasurable harm. This was particularly true in the governing of a people like the Jews, which was a difficult enough proposition at best.

D. The Jewish War with Rome, and After.

A succession of seven Roman procurators ruled Palestine from 44 to 66 A. D., that is, from the death of Herod Agrippa I to the breaking out of the great Jewish revolt. Of the seven only the fourth and the fifth—Felix (52-60 A. D.) and Festus (60-62 A. D.)—have any direct relation to the New Testament (see Acts 23-26). Felix was a former slave, and according to Tacitus conducted himself in keeping with his antecedents: "With all manner of cruelty and lust he exercised royal functions in the spirit of a slave" (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5:9). The powerful Pallas, at Rome, was his brother, and "he believed that he might commit all sorts of enormities with impunity" (*ibid.*, *Annals* 12:54). Festus was a very much better man, but he died in two years, too soon to have undone much of the harm which Felix had done. The two remaining procurators, ruling from 62 to 66 A. D., were the worst of the lot. Events were steadily moving toward a crisis in the relation between the Roman Empire and the Jews in Palestine.

The Jewish war with Rome broke out in 66 and was finally ended in 73 A. D. The underlying causes are to be found in the lack of tact and general inefficiency of the procurators on the one hand and the fanaticism of Jewish revolutionists on the other hand. We have seen that the Roman government was not oppressive in itself but that much depended on the governors. Hence it was very unfortunate that those who filled the office in Palestine in this critical period should have been for

the most part men utterly unfitted for the task. The Jewish extremists gained far more adherents than would otherwise have been the case, and minor insurrections were the order of the day long before the great revolt began (cf. Acts 5:36; 21:38).

The immediate occasion of the outbreak seems to have been a jest at the expense of Florus, the last of the seven procurators. This governor, who was distinguished chiefly for the effective use which he made of his office in enriching himself, finally went so far as to abstract large funds from the Temple treasury. This of course aroused the Jews to the highest pitch of fury. A couple of their number gave expression to their contempt in sarcastic fashion by sending around baskets in which gifts might be placed for the poor and needy Florus. The governor was prompt to avenge the insult. A part of Jerusalem was plundered by the Roman soldiery and a large number of citizens were seized and crucified. This happened on May 16, in the year 66. The uprising which followed resembled the Maccabean revolt in that it spread rapidly and at first had extraordinary success. By September the Roman troops in Jerusalem had been compelled to surrender. (Afterward they were treacherously slaughtered.) In October a large force led by the Roman governor of the province of Syria was compelled to retire after an unsuccessful attack on Jerusalem, and early in November this force was cut to pieces by the Jews in a ravine near Beth-Horon.

These successes led the more moderate and substantial element of the Jewish population to take increased interest in the movement. They began to try to organize the revolution. One of their moves was to send Josephus, a young aristocrat then thirty years of age, to command in Galilee. The post was a very important one, since it was in Galilee that the Romans were expected to make their first attack. The appointment

was indeed strange. There would seem to have been every reason why such a command should not have been given to Josephus, whose training had been for the profession of rabbi, and who had the further, rather serious, disqualification of being favorably disposed to the cause of the enemy. However, in one respect the move was fortunate. Josephus afterward wrote a book in which he gave a detailed account of his experiences, and thus we are enabled to know a great deal more than we would otherwise have known about the war.

In the spring of 67 A. D. the veteran Roman General Vespasian, afterward emperor, invaded Galilee with a force of some sixty thousand men. Josephus, according to his own account, had been very energetic in preparing for the defense, but there was much opposition to him on the part of his own countrymen, and the Romans, almost without striking a blow, were able to occupy the greater part of Galilee. The only serious check which they received was at the stronghold of Jotapata, where the Jews withstood a siege of forty-seven days. Their commander covered himself with glory—if we may take his word for it. It was in July that the fortress was captured. Josephus, taken to Roman headquarters, fell back on his cleverness and predicted to the victorious general that he would become emperor. During the remainder of the year the subjugation of Galilee was completed, and in the early part of 68 Perea and much of Judaea were restored to Roman control.

In June of the year 68 the emperor Nero died. Upon receiving the news Vespasian, who had been about to begin the siege of Jerusalem, decided to suspend operations for a time. The future of the Empire was uncertain. Affairs were in a state of great turmoil. Three successive rulers—Galba, Otho, and Vitellius—occupied the throne within a year. In July of 69 Vespasian him-

self was proclaimed emperor. He went to Rome in 70, leaving his son Titus in command in Palestine. Meanwhile Jerusalem had been the scene of civil strife. Two —for a time three—parties had contended for mastery within its walls. The reserve supply of provisions had been largely destroyed. Yet it was only after a siege of five months that Titus and his legions found the city completely in their hands. They destroyed it almost totally. Such of the inhabitants as had not fallen by the sword were executed, sent to work in the mines, reserved for gladiatorial contests, or, in the case of the finest physical specimens, kept to grace the triumph of the conqueror in Rome.

Josephus, who had proved himself a shrewd prophet if not a good general, did not fail of his reward. He sailed with Titus to Rome, where he was granted a pension and the Roman citizenship. He had apartments in the house which Vespasian himself had occupied before he became emperor. There he engaged in literary pursuits and lived a life of ease for many years.

Vespasian reserved Palestine as a private possession, ruled by governors. Roman law was applied more strictly than had been the case before. By the year 73 the last Jewish stronghold, Masada, had fallen, and the war was at an end. The political history of Palestine from this time to the end of the century is uneventful. Also it is of minor importance to the student of Christianity, since the followers of Jesus had already outgrown the status of a sect of Jews and were establishing themselves as a distinct religion in the world outside of Palestine. We need merely note, then, that there was another Jewish revolt under the emperor Trajan (115-117 A. D.), and a more serious one under Hadrian (132-135 A. D.). This last rebellion may be said to mark the end of the Jewish state. Much of Palestine was left a

desert. A Roman colony was planted on the site of Jerusalem, Jews being forbidden entrance on pain of death.

Jamnia, a town near the Mediterranean, now became the religious center of Judaism. There the most famous rabbis gathered, and now that the Temple and the Sanhedrin were no more the study of the Law and the development of the Messianic hope served in some measure to fill their place in the interest of the pious Jew.

Meanwhile the Empire was evolving, in its usual opportunistic fashion, a policy with reference to Christianity. Its general attitude toward religions was one of great tolerance, yet at times moral or political considerations would lead it to interfere. There was a widespread belief that Christians, in their secret meetings, engaged in grossly barbaric and immoral practices. Thus popular sentiment was arrayed against them, a sentiment which the emperor Nero made use of when, in 64 A. D., he tried to shift from himself the blame for the burning of Rome. His claim that the catastrophe was due to a Christian plot led to the first of the great persecutions, and from that time until the conversion of Constantine, in 312 A. D., Christianity was viewed with more or less constant suspicion by the Roman government. Its adherents refused to participate in the worship of the emperor, which, with other reasons, led to their being considered a menace on political as well as moral grounds. This phase of the situation came into prominence first in the reign of Domitian (81-96 A. D.). We have met with it already (see Chap. VI) and we shall have occasion to deal with it more fully farther on (see Chap. XV).

CHAPTER XII

THE JEWISH BACKGROUND: CULTURAL

A. The Land and People of Palestine.

The name Palestine does not appear in the New Testament. It is derived directly from the name Philistia, but has a broader use. "The land of the Philistines" was limited to the lowland region along the Mediterranean south of Phoenicia, but not long after New Testament times the Romans began to apply the name Palestina to a larger area—the whole southern part of the western Mediterranean borderland. This use has survived to our time. In the Old Testament pretty much the same territory is covered by the names Land of Canaan and Land of Israel. In the New Testament the latter name occurs in Matt. 2:20-21. There is no term in frequent use in the New Testament which corresponds to Canaan in the Old Testament or to Palestine or the "Holy Land" in modern usage. In several passages the name Syria is so used as to include Palestine along with the entire region bordering the western shore of the Mediterranean. Thus in Matt 4:24 it is said that the fame of Jesus "went forth into all Syria" (cf. Acts 18:18; 20:3; 21:3).

Palestine is a small country. The area west of the Jordan River is about 6,000 square miles. An additional 4,000 square miles are to be added when the region east of the Jordan is included in the reckoning. This total, about 10,000 square miles, gives an area approximately equal to that of the state of Maryland. The republic of Costa Rica is more than twice as large, Portugal more

than three times as large. Estimates as to the population in New Testament times vary enormously—all the way from 700,000 to 5,000,000. Archeological evidence indicates that it was much larger then than now. Turkish rule has had a bad effect, and there is the added fact that Palestine is not at the crossroads of great civilizations in modern as it was in ancient times.

Among occupations agriculture was chief. Grain crops were important, as were the products of the olive tree and the vine. Fishing was an important industry in the neighborhood of the Sea of Galilee. A ready market was provided by the flourishing towns in the neighborhood. Some of Jesus' disciples were fishermen, and this industry probably was one of the main sources of income of the Teacher and his band. Commerce—"business," as we call it—was active in Palestine in New Testament times. Some, but not all, of it was in the hands of foreigners. In this sort of competition Jews have always been able to hold their own. Much labor was required, skilled and unskilled, in connection with the extensive building operations of the time. A large body of Jews served as priests, devoting themselves to the service of the Temple and its religious ritual. There are several references to physicians in the New Testament (e. g. Mark 5:26; Luke 8:43; 4:23; Col. 4:14), and we know that Jewish physicians were celebrated in post-Biblical times. But judged by modern standards their knowledge and practice of their art of course were crude. In the main the learned professions were embraced in one, that of scribe. Of this important profession we shall have more to say.

The population was mainly Jewish, particularly in the south. In Galilee there were many non-Jewish settlements. The Jews were a proud people who endured present misfortunes largely by dwelling on the glories of the past. They were an exclusive people and strove to maintain this exclusiveness by preserving their purity of

blood and by cultivating in each generation anew a deep reverence for the great institutions peculiar to them—especially the Temple and the Law. But the task was not an easy one. The Samaritans, an alien people in their midst, had been for some centuries a constant menace to this ideal of exclusiveness. The mutual hatred which this situation produced is clearly reflected in the New Testament. And since long before the New Testament period Jewish religious nationalism had found itself confronted with a yet more formidable enemy. Even before Alexander's time, but more particularly in the wake of his campaigns, the Greek language, Greek customs, Greek commercial enterprise, Greek philosophical and religious thought, had been steadily and irresistably conquering the Near East. In New Testament times many cities in Perea, Galilee, and the coast region were largely, even dominantly, Greek. And business and other pursuits brought the foreigners into other Jewish cities as well. It brought them there not only as transient visitors but as residents. They brought with them their foreign customs, culture (e. g. pictorial and sculptural art, which the Jewish Law forbade), amusements, religion. Even Jerusalem, under Herod the Great, had its theater and amphitheater. Then, too, Jews who had lived abroad—and there were many of them, as we shall see—often returned and resumed their life in Palestine. They had come into close contact with the dominant culture of the outside world, and henceforth their attitude toward it could not be quite the same as that of their countrymen whose lives were lived wholly in Palestine. In short it was increasingly hard for the rigid exclusion which was the ideal of Judaism to be maintained. Many Jews gave up the attempt, but on others the effect of the outside pressure was just the opposite. Their zeal was increased, their hatred inflamed. It was this latter group which brought on, and lost, the great

war with Rome. Meanwhile the resistless forces which were making for the union of Greek and Jewish culture were finding another medium of expression—the rising Christian church.

B. Jewish Parties and Sects.

Much the most important party—the most representative of typical Judaism—was the party or sect of the Pharisees. The name, which means "separated," points to the ideal which dominated this most popular and influential of Jewish sects. Its membership embraced those Jews who took their Judaism very seriously, and were determined to guard it from corrupting influences from without. We hear of it first during the Maccabean period, but it had as its immediate predecessor a party with similar outlook called the Chasidim, or Hasidaeans (the "Pious"), which took form under the stress of the persecutions preceding the revolt of the Maccabees. Indeed the ideal which the Pharisaic party embodied loomed large in Judaism from the time of Ezra down. How large it loomed, at a given time, depended on how seriously the purity of Jewish faith and practice was felt to be endangered at that time. Ezra and Nehemiah, upon their return to Jerusalem after the Exile, had found the very existence of the national religion and culture threatened, as they thought, by the custom of free intercourse with foreigners which had grown up, especially by the very frequent marriages between Jews and foreigners. To the task of correcting this error they devoted themselves with great zeal and strenuosity, and with such effect that Judaism bore the stamp of their influence for many centuries. But the menace was destined to reappear in other forms. From the time of Antiochus Epiphanes on the encroachment of Hellenism—the culture of the great Graeco-Roman world —was an all but constant factor in the situation, and

thus there was continued occasion for Pharisaic leadership.

What sort of a person was the typical Pharisee? We have seen that the dominant thing in his outlook was his sense of the unique value of his national heritage. And we can also see that the effect of this on his character was likely to be in part fortunate and in part unfortunate. On the one hand it would, and did, lead him to devote himself to the study of the literary classics of his people. The possibilities in such study for the enrichment of life we are in a position to judge, since the same classics have been preserved to us and the characters of some of our greatest men and women have been largely molded by them. On the other hand his identifying of his cultural and religious heritage with the fortunes of the little nation to which he belonged had a narrowing influence. The "chosen people" idea undoubtedly made for national solidity, and in the providence of God it played an important role in world history, but it was not conducive to the development of broad vision and well-rounded character. We gather that in personality some at least of the Pharisees were narrow and unlovely men to whom religion was mainly a formal scheme for getting right with a stern and jealous God. But to assume that they were all like this would be grossly unfair. Even in the New Testament, which took shape at a time when Christianity had broken with Judaism and there was much bitter hostility between the two, there are exceptions to the general disfavor with which they are viewed. Nicodemus and Gamaliel were members of the party, and Paul, long after he became a Christian, was still not ashamed of having been a Pharisee (see Acts 23:6; 26:5; Phil. 3:5). Luke has two accounts of Jesus dining with Pharisees (7:36; 11:37). The disposition now manifested by both Christian and Jewish historians to picture the Pharisees less in the light of prejudice and

more in the light of reality is one of the signs of a better day. (See further under "C" below.)

It is approximately accurate to speak of the Pharisees as the "center" party, the Sadducees as the "right," and the Zealots as the "left." The history of the Sadducean party runs closely parallel to that of the Pharisees. Already in Nehemiah's time we find the high priest and his family tending to form an aristocracy, and we find this aristocracy committed to a policy of freedom of intercourse with foreigners. Nehemiah, with the backing of the Persian king, overcame their opposition, but the tendency which they represented reappeared, in the Maccabean period, in the party of the Sadducees. The Sadducees were orthodox, holding in general to the old-time religious beliefs and practices. But with them political and economic considerations were more important, and religion comparatively less important, than with the Pharisees. They were interested less in preserving the purity of the Jewish religion and more in strengthening the Jewish state. From this point of view contact with the outside world seemed a thing to be cultivated rather than shunned, though the Sadducees had learned by experience that such a policy was unpopular and should be advocated only cautiously.

At the opposite extreme from the aristocratic, political, pro-Hellenistic party of the Sadducees were the Zealots —fierce, violent, fanatically religious, and anti-foreign, eager to make real by force of arms the nation's ideal of God as their only king. Probably the Zealots were never as clearly defined a body as the Pharisees or the Sadducees. They may be thought of as the fanatical and militant wing of the Pharisees.

A fourth group were the Essenes, a smaller body and more detached from the main currents of events. They lived an ascetic and communistic life, in this respect resembling the Christian monks of later centuries. Their

religious beliefs were closely similar to those of the Pharisees, particularly in that they held the Law in great reverence and placed much stress on ceremonial purity. Their living apart from other men made it the easier for them to put into practice the Pharisaic ideal of exclusiveness. Yet they were noted for kindness and charity, as well as for piety. There has been much speculation as to their origin. Some of their customs, as for example the veneration of the sun, seem to point to antecedents outside of Judaism. Philo and Josephus agree in estimating their numbers in their time at about four thousand.

We hear also of the Zadokites They had their origin in the priesthood, as did the Sadducees, but the two parties represented opposite tendencies. The Zadokites were reforming priests, whose conception of the priesthood seems to have been on a higher ethical and spiritual plane than that of the rank and file. Having failed in an attempt at reform from within they took with them certain sympathizers among the laity and migrated to Damascus. This occurred, apparently, shortly before the Maccabean revolt. Later they returned and settled in the cities of Palestine, where they came into violent antagonism with the Pharisees. They valued the Prophets more highly, and the tradition less highly, than did the Pharisees. This may account in part for the hostility. What is known of this sect has been learned through the discovery, only a few years ago, of fragments of a book which it produced. When the book was written the near advent of a Messiah was expected. He was to be of the house of Aaron, and Dr. Charles thinks that it was on one of the sons of Herod and his Maccabean wife Mariamne that the hope was fixed. If so the book was probably written only a few years before Jesus was born.

One more group requires mention, the Am-ha-'aretz (People of the Land). In earlier times, after the Exile,

this name was applied to people living in Palestine who were not of Hebrew descent (see e. g. Ezra 4:4). Later, we gather, a somewhat different application came into vogue. The designation "People of the Land" came to point not so much to non-Jewish blood as to failure to measure up to the Pharisaic standard in the observance of the Law.

> The Law had not yet, it would seem, penetrated into every section of society; on the whole, both the Law and its teachers were extremely popular, but there were some who, for one reason or another, did not or could not observe its ritual ordinances. They were not scrupulous about the burdensome dues; they ate food from which those dues were not subtracted; they did not observe in their fulness the dietary laws; perhaps they did not observe the Sabbath very strictly; some of them, perhaps, were morally by no means above suspicion. These people, who had fallen, or were falling, away from the ranks of those who honestly sought to observe the Law, were neglected and shunned by the teachers and by the law-abiding Jews. They were looked down upon and disliked as ignorant, as law breakers, as unclean. (C. G. Montefiore, in Peake's *Commentary,* pp. 621-622.)

What proportion of the population were included in the Am-ha-'aretz it is impossible to say.

Of these various Jewish parties and groups the Pharisees, as might be expected, figure with greatest prominence in the New Testament. The name occurs nearly a hundred times, as against fifteen references to the Sadducees. The usual role of the Pharisees is that of opposition to Jesus and his followers, but there are noteworthy exceptions, as we have seen. Matthew alone of the New Testament books has the phrase "the Pharisees

and Sadducees"—picturing the two opposing groups as one in their hostility to Jesus (see 16:1, 6, 11, 12). Elsewhere the Sadducees are mentioned almost exclusively in connection with their disbelief in resurrection of the dead, to which reference will be made below. The Zealots appear scarcely at all. The name "Zealot" is twice applied to Simon, one of the disciples of Jesus (Luke 6:15; Acts 1:13). Presumably this is to be taken as indicating that he belonged to the party, but nothing further on the subject is known. The "Assassins" of Acts 21:38 apparently were Zealots of a particularly murderous type. In Acts 5:37 is a reference to a revolt "in the days of the enrolment" led by Judas of Galilee. This revolt, also referred to by Josephus, is usually thought to have marked the origin of the Zealot party.

The Essenes are not mentioned in the New Testament. There has been a great deal of discussion as to their possible influence on early Christianity, some writers maintaining that John the Baptist and Jesus were members of the sect. All that can be said with confidence is that the beliefs and practices of Essenes and early Christians show interesting parallels. Proof of any vital connection between the two is not at hand. The Zadokites are not referred to in the New Testament, but Dr. Charles has an interesting conjecture as to a connection between them and primitive Christian history. He calls attention to their appreciation of the Prophets and their expectation of a Messiah—not to mention other seeming parallels with early Christianity—and thinks it not unreasonable to conclude that they formed part of "the great company of the priests" that became "obedient to the faith" (Acts 6:7; see Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,* II, 785ff.). We may at any rate say that the knowledge that there was such a reform movement within the priesthood throws light on this statement in Acts. It would seem that priests of the Saddu-

cean type would not be particularly likely to become followers of the Nazarene.

What we know of the Am-ha-'aretz, in turn, throws light on the frequent references in the Gospels to "sinners" (usually grouped with publicans), a class toward which Jesus assumed an attitude in sharp contrast with the attitude of the Pharisees. Montefiore, an able and high-minded Jewish scholar, concedes it to have been

> a marked weakness of this legal religion that, while it taught, and its votaries practiced, compassion to the poor and the afflicted, if they sought to observe the Law, it did not teach redemptive compassion and kindness to those who fell away . . . It feared contamination, and bade the honest observer keep away and keep apart from the negligent and the sinner. Thus these, ostracized and ignored, fell deeper and deeper into the mire. For such men and women Jesus had a new message; he gave them a new hope; he brought to them a compassion and a love to which they had been unused before. (Peake's *Commentary,* 622.)

C. The Scribes.

As the Pharisees were the most important and most respected party in Jewish life, so the most influential and respected *profession* was that of the scribes. They were the Biblical scholars of the Jews in the time of Jesus, but as the Bible of the Jews (particularly the Law) was far more closely associated with the life of the people in all its phases than is the case with us, so the activities of a Jewish scribe were many-sided as compared with those of the average theological professor of our day. In addition to being professional scholars, they were, in the main, the teachers, preachers, writers, lawyers, judges, and to a considerable extent the legislators of the

Jews. All this grew out of their primary function, that of interpreting the Law.

The profession of scribe, like so much else in the later Judaism, may be traced back to Ezra's time. It was then that the Law (*i.e.* the Pentateuch, the first five books of our Old Testament) was codified and set forth as the supreme guide of Jewish life. At first, as might be expected, the priests served as the special guardians and teachers of the Law.

> Gradually, however, this was changed. The higher the law rose in the estimation of the people, the more did its study and exposition become an independent business. It was the law of God, and every individual of the nation had the same interest as the priests in knowing and obeying it. Hence *non-priestly Israelites* more and more occupied themselves with its scientific study. An independent class of "biblical scholars or scribes," *i.e.* of men who made acquaintance with the law a profession, was formed beside the priests. And when in the time of Hellenism the priests, at least those of the higher strata, often applied themselves to heathen culture, and more or less neglected the law of their fathers, the scribes ever appeared in a relative contrast to the priests. It was no longer the priests, but the scribes, who were the zealous guardians of the law. Hence they were also from that time onwards the *real teachers of the people,* over whose spiritual lives they bore complete sway.

Thus Schürer describes the rise, and growth in prestige, of the profession of scribe (*History of the Jewish People,* II, 1, 313). Ezra himself is called "the priest the scribe" (Neh. 8:9; 12:26), but probably such combination of the two offices was unusual in later times.

The labors of the scribes took their start, as we have

seen, from the conception of the Law as divinely given for the regulation of all of life. As a matter of fact there were many phases of Jewish life in the time of Jesus which were not covered—at least in any definite or explicit fashion—by precepts of the Law. Its books were already several centuries old, and much of the matter in them dated from periods a great deal earlier than the time of writing the books. Here, then, was the primary task of the scribes—to interpret the ancient precepts and apply them to the minute details of the life of their time. They went about it in a casuistic, hair-splitting fashion which often seems ridiculous to the modern mind. But prejudice against their method should not be allowed to blind us to their seriousness or to the practical usefulness of their work. It may be doubted whether our efforts to make the accumulated wisdom of the past contribute to the needs of today are much more successful than were theirs.

The scribes engaged in a great deal of discussion and disputation with each other. On some points rival "schools" held different views, but in general the interpretations were collective products of Jewish scholarship and as such were accepted by the people as not only expositions of the Law of Moses but as themselves having the force of law. This was the position of the Pharisees, and the parties which placed less stress on the authority of the scribal interpretations—notably the Sadducees—were in the minority. Yet for centuries this "tradition," as the mass of accumulated exegesis was called, was preserved mainly in oral form. Not until about 200 A. D. was a great body of it reduced to writing and embodied in what is called the Mishna. Later scribes added their comments to the Mishna, thus forming the Gemara. The Talmud consists of the Mishna plus the Gemara.

The Tradition was of two main sorts, called Halachah

and Haggadah. The type of interpretation of which we have been speaking—the development and application of the commands and precepts of the Mosaic Law—was known as Halachah. But everyone who has read the Pentateuch knows that it contains, in addition to commands and precepts, a great deal of narrative and other matter of a not strictly legal character. This also had binding authority, and must therefore be developed with a view to its practical usefulness. Thus was produced the other type of exegesis, the Haggadah. Fairly abundant speciments have been preserved, not only in the Talmud but in the writings of Philo and Josephus and in the miscellaneous Jewish writings known to us as Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. We may see particularly good examples of it in the Book of Jubilees (second century B. C.; classed with the Pseudepigrapha), which is a haggadic re-writing of Genesis. In the Old Testament itself we may see the method at work in the Books of Chronicles, written probably about the third century B. C. for the purpose of re-interpreting earlier narratives and drawing lessons from them.

The method used in Haggadic exegesis—perhaps even more than in the case of the Halachah—is hard for the modern Occidental mind to appreciate.

> It is an amplification and remodeling of what was originally given, according to the views and necessities of later times. . . . The history is worked up by combining the different statements in the text with each other, completing one by another, settling the chronology, etc. Or the religious and ethical parts are manipulated by formulating dogmatic propositions from isolated prophetic utterances, by bringing these into relation to each other, and thus obtaining a kind of dogmatic system. But this stricter kind of treatment is overgrown by the much freer kind,

> which deals in a perfectly unrestrained manner with the text, and supplements it by additions of the most arbitrary and manifold kind. (Schürer, *op. cit.*, II, 1, 339.)

The lives of the patriarchs, and of later worthies in the history of Israel, are elaborated endlessly. Meager references to incidents connected with Adam, Enoch, Abraham, or Moses yield astonishing results when subjected to the Haggadic process. Yet we should not think of the process as involving dishonesty. To so think of it is to look at the whole matter from a point of view very different from that of the scribes who developed and practiced it. "The higher the credit and importance of the sacred history rose in the ideas of the people, the more thorough was the labor bestowed upon it, and the more urgent was the impulse to give more accuracy, more copious elaboration of details, and to surround the whole with a more complete and brighter halo" (*ibid.*, 341). The scribe worked with the twofold aim of glorifying the ancient writings and furnishing guidance for daily life to his countrymen. It was not an unworthy aim.

Teaching, we infer, was an important part of the work of the scribes. The more famous scribes in particular gathered large groups of students about them, instructing them in the Law and the Tradition, and thus insuring that in the next generation the work of interpretation would go on. We hear of schools in the Temple and in the synagogues. Pupils, as well as other Jews, addressed the teacher as *Rabbi* ("My master") and held him in the highest reverence. He was supposed to receive no payment for this or other work connected with his profession of scribe, but to obtain his livelihood from a trade or business or in some other way. It is doubtful, however, if this principle was adhered to rigidly. The catechetical method of teaching was employed. The ideal

set before the pupil was to retain everything in memory and hand it down unchanged; hence there was constant repetition of what was to be learned. The same word meant "to repeat" and "to teach."

Undoubtedly the scribe often served also in the capacity of judge, though the position could be filled by others as well. There is evidence that scribes formed part of the Sanhedrin, the supreme court at Jerusalem (see Acts 4:5; 6:12), and it is natural to suppose that as far as possible scribes would be secured to serve as judges in the smaller local courts as well.

The office of preacher as we know it had no close parallel in Jewish society. The synagogue did not have a regular "pastor." The custom of having a lecture or exhortation in connection with the Sabbath service existed, to be sure, but any person thought capable might be invited to deliver it. Who, then, would be invited? Again it is inherently probable that a scribe would serve in almost all cases when a scribe was available.

Finally, the scribes were not only interpreters but producers of literature. The Jewish Scripture has three main parts: the Law (Torah), the Prophets, and the Writings (Kethubim, Hagiographa). We have seen that the first group of books, the Law, came to have the status of Scripture in Ezra's time. Most of the material of the second group, the Prophets, was already at hand at this time, but it was not until about 200 B. C. that it attained canonical, *i.e.* Scriptural, authority. During the intervening centuries the scribes had been at work on its material, collecting, annotating, and arranging it. (This group included Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, as well as the books known to us as prophetic. Daniel, however, belonged to the third group.) The books of the third group, the Hagiographa, were of miscellaneous character (including all in our Old Testament not contained in either of the other groups) and of

relatively late origin. Their collection was gradual, and the group as a whole seems not to have had a fixed canonical status until nearly 100 A. D. To a large extent they are compilations of previously existing material (*e.g.* Psalms and Proverbs). Little that is definite is known as to who the authors or compilers were. We can only judge in a general way from the interests which the books themselves reveal. And when we study them from this point of view we find that interest in *the Law* is especially pervasive and dominant. The same may be said of much similar literature, produced in the period from 200 B. C. to 100 A. D., which did not win a place in the Scripture canon as accepted by the Jews of Palestine—the so-called Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. It is highly probable that it was from the circle of the scribes that most of this literary output came. Who else, indeed—unless perhaps priests with scribal tastes—would be capable of producing it? And the variety which it shows—devotional poetry, maxims for conduct, grapplings with great problems of religion and philosophy, reinterpretations of history and visions of a better time soon to be—this range of thought and interest should warn us against overstressing the supposed narrowness of Jewish culture in the period of the New Testament.

In the Gospels the scribes are met with often, as every reader knows. There are also several references to them in Acts, and one in 1 Corinthians. The total in the New Testament is about sixty, to which are to be added a dozen references to the same profession under the names "lawyer" or "doctor of the law." "The chief priests and the scribes" is a common expression, indicating the leading men of the nation in religion and scholarship. Sometimes "the elders" are included, this term being applied to members of a municipal council, particularly the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem. Almost as frequent is the phrase "the scribes and the Pharisees." This would seem to

have meant "the scribes and the Pharisees *in general,*" or something like that. We can scarcely doubt that a large majority of the scribes belonged to the party of the Pharisees. Yet it is probable that some Sadducees also devoted themselves to the professional study of the Law, as is indirectly suggested by the expression "the scribes *of the Pharisees*" in Mark 2:16 (cf. Luke 5:30; Acts 23:9).

To be acquainted with the scribes—their ideals, their work, their influence—is to have gone a long way toward an understanding of Jewish culture in the period of the New Testament. In general the New Testament writers were unfriendly to them, as in the case of the Pharisees. Yet they give us evidence that Jesus held the office of scribe in high esteem and reverence. They "sit on Moses' seat," he says. He bids his disciples, as well as the Jewish populace in general, obey their precepts, follow the way of life which their teachings set forth (Matt. 23:1-3a). Scribes are included with prophets and "wise men" among the representatives of God whom the Jews have rejected as now they reject Jesus himself (Matt. 23:24). But the very fact of his reverence for the office made Jesus feel the more keenly the failure of many scribes with whom he came into contact to measure up to it. He found them formal, professional, distant, proud, arguing about the externals of their religion rather than living the heart of it. The need of moral and spiritual leadership was a crying need, but it was not forthcoming from those who should be providing it. Herein was tragedy (Matt. 23:3b-33). Happily, however, there were scribes in Jesus' time whose outlook was not unlike his own, who could appreciate him and whom he could appreciate (see Mark 12:28-34).

The scribes' conception of Scripture, and their methods of interpreting and applying it, have had great and obvious influence not only on the New Testament but on

Christian thought and history in subsequent centuries. Examples of scribal exegesis of the more fanciful sort are not wanting in the New Testament. Paul, who was educated in Jerusalem as a scribe, naturally was somewhat addicted to it (see *e.g.* Rom. 10:6-8; Gal. 3:16; 4:22-25). On the whole, however, there is less of this type of interpretation in the New Testament than might have been expected. Some of its writers, as Paul and the author of Hebrews, were trained expositors, but that was scarcely the dominant element in the equipment of any one of them. They were men inspired by a Life, mastered by an Idea which that life had called forth. This gave a spontaneity, an earnestness, a passion, to what they wrote; gave them too much else to work for and think about for them to indulge much in exegesis of the finely spun sort. It was rather in later centuries that Christian interpreters arose who could compete on their own terms with the most subtle and ingenious of the scribes.

The fact would seem to be that the scribal method of interpreting Scripture was an almost necessary supplement, or offset, to the scribal theory of what Scripture was. Where a group of ancient writings are regarded as the Word of God in a strict and exclusive sense there arises inevitably the problem of preventing the present and future from being bound too rigidly to—progress from being limited by—the past. The scribes solved the problem in a tolerably satisfactory way through the freedom of interpretation which they practiced and allowed. The product of their exegesis might or might not have a sound basis in the passage on which it was supposed to be based. Also, its religious or ethical level might or might not, from our point of view, be high. But at any rate an interpretation which won sufficient assent to become fixed in the Tradition must be said to represent a serious attempt, on the part of those best qualified, to

state for the guidance of their countrymen what seemed to them to be true, to be right, to be the will of God. And this applies also to the outstanding Christian interpreters down to the modern period.

To-day we cannot solve the problem in the scribes' way. The modern interpreter feels himself bound, first of all, to be true to what the Scripture writer meant to say. We are moving toward a solution, but it is along other lines. In the first place, the scribal theory of Scripture, while by no means extinct, is being modified: the idea of finality and infallibility in all details being abandoned and stress being placed on the conception of the Scriptures as a *progressive* revelation of man's discovery of God and of God's dealings with man. In the second place, there is increasing recognition of the right and the duty, especially on the part of qualified leaders, to explore the things of God anew, in the confidence that the Spirit of Truth will, in his own time and way, guide us into all the truth. But the problem of securing a richly profitable use of the Scriptures, and preventing such use as will make them an obstructive force, is still with us and is likely to be with us for a long time to come. We are not in a position to throw stones at the scribes or to scoff at the influence of their labors on Jewish life.

CHAPTER XIII

THE JEWISH BACKGROUND: RELIGIOUS

To rigidly distinguish the religious aspects of a nation's life from the cultural is of course impossible. To attempt it in the case of the Jews would be particularly undesirable, since with them religion was closely bound up with the whole of life. The scribes, with whom we dealt in the last chapter, might be considered as religious functionaries; and the institution of the synagogue, with which we are to deal in the present chapter, was an important factor in Jewish cultural, as well as religious, life. Yet in spite of such overlapping the cultural and the religious are separable along broad general lines, and for convenience of discussion such separation of them as is here adopted seems justified.

A. The Temple, Its Priesthood and Its Ritual.

Solomon's temple had been destroyed when Jerusalem was captured by Nebuchadrezzar in 586 B. C. It had stood for more than four centuries. Zerubbabel's temple, as it is usually called, was built by the Jews who returned from exile, being completed in 516 B. C. It was probably a more modest structure than the earlier temple, though occupying the same site. It was still standing when Herod the Great became king in 40 B. C., though it had been desecrated and more or less seriously damaged from time to time, especially during the struggles of the Maccabean period.

Herod's temple, with which we are concerned here, was

apparently a restoration of Zerubbabel's temple rather than an entirely new structure. But it was a restoration on a much more magnificent scale. Restoring native temples was a favorite pastime with Roman governors at this period; Herod was following the fashion. The work was begun in 20 B. C. and completed under the supervision of Herod's great-grandson, Herod Agrippa II, in 64 A. D. A half dozen years later, when Jerusalem was taken by Titus in 70 A. D., it was destroyed.

The temple area, *i.e.* the temple proper with its surrounding courts, chambers, and colonnades occupied the summit of Mount Moriah, one of the two main eminences of Jerusalem, on the east side of the city. Its extent has been computed to have been about eight acres (610x585 feet). But these dimensions given by Josephus are disputed by some modern authorities. In any case it was rectangular, nearly square. The main approach from the city was over a bridge and through a gate on the west side of the wall surrounding the area. Once inside the outer wall the first thing to attract one's attention was a colonnade, with double rows of monolithic marble columns extending around the wall. On the south side there were quadruple rows, forming the "Royal Porticoes." On the east side was "Solomon's Porch" (John 10:23; Acts 3:11; 5:12), which was said to have survived from the time of Solomon. There were roofs of carved cedar over the colonnades. Inside the colonnades was the outer court, occupying the greater part of the entire area. It is spoken of as the "Court of the Gentiles," because non-Jews were allowed to enter it, though all that lay inside the walls of the inner court was closed to them (cf. Acts 21:26ff.). In this outer court buying and selling were permitted to be carried on. The inner court, with its various inclosures, lay somewhat to the north and west of the middle of the outer court, and occupied higher ground. It also was rectangular in shape, its greater

length being from east to west. It occupied perhaps not more than one-fourth or one-fifth of the entire space within the colonnades. Its wall had nine gates. One gate, on the east side, was much more costly than the rest. This was probably the "Beautiful" gate of Acts 3:2.

The eastern part of the inner court was occupied by the "Court of the Women." The western part contained the "Court of the Priests," together with a "Court of Israelites." Inside the Priests' Court, occupying high ground, was the temple building, the House. The Women's Court, so called, was the largest of the areas within the wall of the inner court. It was, in fact, the general meeting place of the Jews, the women being confined to galleries. Into the smaller Court of Israelites, adjoining the Priests' Court, the women might not come. Flanking these various courts were many "chambers"—rooms where salt, wood, the shewbread, the vestments, the musical instruments, etc. were kept. The altar of burnt offering, with various appurtenances, stood within the Priests' Court, in front of the entrance to the House.

The House itself was rectangular in shape and faced the east. There was a great "porch" in front, a hundred cubits in both height and width and eleven cubits deep. The outside breadth of the building was seventy cubits, so that the "porch" projected fifteen cubits on each side. It must have had the appearance of a high and massive wall in front of the House, with an entrance in the middle, forty cubits high and twenty broad. Inside the entrance there were two main apartments: an outer one, the "Holy Place," twenty by forty cubits, and an inner one, the "Most Holy Place," twenty cubits square. Around these apartments there were smaller rooms, thirty-eight in number, in which utensils were kept and priests resided. The Holy Place contained three articles of furniture: the table of shewbread, the altar of incense,

and the seven-branched candlestick or lamp-stand. The Most Holy Place contained no furniture. It was separated from the Holy Place by a veil (according to the Mishna, two veils). It was entered only by the high priest and by him only once a year.

The stone of which the House was built was white marble. Plates of gold, covering the eastern front, reflected the rays of the rising sun. Parts of the side walls were also covered with gold. Such a structure, situated on such a height, must have made upon beholders an impression of splendor and majesty.

A clear mental picture of the temple area and what it contained aids in the understanding of not a few New Testament passages. In particular it must be understood that the word "temple" (ἱερόν) regularly designates the sacred area as a whole, or one of the courts, colonnades, or apartments rather than the temple building proper. For this another word, "sanctuary" (ναός), was used. Thus it was not in the temple proper that the Jewish youths shouted out their enthusiasm for Jesus, but in the outer court (Matt. 21:15). The temple authorities might well have been "moved with indignation" had it been in the sacred House (cf. Matt. 24:1; for references to the "sanctuary," or temple proper, see Matt. 23:35; 27:40; Mark 15:38; Luke 1:9; etc.). But the English translations do not always preserve the distinction between the two words. There is some doubt as to whether it is preserved by the author of Matt. in 27:5.

Officiating in the temple were a great body of priests and Levites, with the high priest at the head. There had been priests among the Israelites, as among other peoples, from ancient times. Formerly soothsaying had been one of their chief duties, but gradually their function came to be mainly that of attending to the temple ritual. At a comparatively early period the limiting of the priesthood to men of the tribe of Levi began, and

after the exile we find a further limiting to a single family, the sons of Aaron, within that tribe. The Levites now appear as an order of temple servants subordinate to the priests.

The exalted position of the high priest was also a late development. In the time of the Maccabees this office came to have attached to it much of the dignity and splendor of the earlier kings, and in New Testament times the high priest was still the native head of the Jewish state, subject of course to Roman authority. His actual power, under the Herods and the procurators, was small as compared with what it had been, yet the position was one which carried with it much prestige. Appointment was made from a small number of families and these formed a select aristocracy. To this circle apparently belonged the "chief priests" of whom we read in the New Testament. Josephus' use of the term is similar. "In the days of Roman rule they were at the head of the Sanhedrim and of the native government generally, and although the majority of them were unquestionably men of Sadducaean tendencies, yet in the actual conduct of affairs they bowed, however reluctantly, to the wishes of the Pharisees" (Schürer, *History of the Jewish People* II, 1, 206; cf. Acts 4:6).

The "captain of the temple" appears in the New Testament and in Josephus as an official of considerable importance (Acts 4:1; 5:24, 26). He was head of the temple police force and had subordinate officers under him (Luke 22:4, 52). The police force was composed mainly of Levites, though priests are said to have served as guards inside the walls of the inner court.

The priests were divided into twenty-four "courses," each serving a week at a time (cf. Luke 1:5). But during the great festivals all of the divisions served simultaneously. There were twenty-four divisions of the Levites, as of the priests. Regular services were held in the tem-

ple twice each day, at dawn and in mid-afternoon. A lamb was sacrificed, there was a "meal offering" and a "drink offering." Incense was burned and there was thanksgiving and prayer. Vocal and instrumental music contributed to the beauty and solemnity of the service. The services on the Sabbath were similar to those on other days except that two lambs were offered and other sacrificial offerings were in like manner increased. On festival days there was a still greater increase in the offerings. All these were prescribed public services.

> But copious as those *public sacrifices* no doubt were, they still seem but few when compared with the multitudes of *private* offerings and sacrifices that were offered. It was the vast number of these latter —so vast in fact as to be well-nigh inconceivable— that gave its peculiar stamp to the worship at Jerusalem. Here day after day whole crowds of victims were slaughtered and whole masses of flesh burnt; and when any of the high festivals came round, there was such a host of sacrifices to dispose of that it was scarcely possible to attend to them all notwithstanding the fact that there were thousands of priests officiating on the occasion. (Schürer, *op. cit.* II, 1, 298.)

The outstanding festival occasions were three: the Passover, Pentecost (the Feast of Weeks), and the Feast of Tabernacles (or Booths). The Passover was held on the fifteenth of the month Nisan (March-April). The paschal lamb was slain on the afternoon of the fourteenth, the blood and the portions for sacrifice being taken to the priests and the rest eaten at home. It was eaten the same evening, but since the Jewish day began at sunset this was reckoned as the fifteenth. As many as ten to twenty persons were allowed to share in a single lamb. Considerable ceremony went with the partaking of the

paschal meal. Immediately following the Passover proper came the "Feast of Unleavened Bread" lasting seven days. Elaborate regulations for the observance of these days are set forth in Num. 28:16-25. The Feast of Pentecost occurred fifty days after the Passover. It lasted only one day. In New Testament times it was regarded as the anniversary of the giving of the Law, hence a sort of birthday of Judaism. In view of the narrative of Acts 2 it may be regarded as also, in a sense, the birthday of the Christian Church. The Feast of Booths lasted eight days—from the fifteenth to the twenty-second of Tishri —corresponding to our September-October. It was a happy autumn holiday season, the people dwelling outdoors in huts or booths formed from the boughs of trees. Sacrifices were far more numerous at this festival than any other. Among customs which attached themselves to it in later times was that of a daily procession during the first seven days from the pool of Siloah to the temple, water being brought and poured out in commemoration of the gift of water in the wilderness. If this custom was observed in Jesus' time, it probably gives us the setting of John 7:37-38, which represents Jesus as speaking to the assembled multitude on the final "great" day of the festival and promising to quench the spiritual thirst of those who would follow him.

All three of these festivals were closely connected with the harvests. The first marked the beginning of the long harvest season in Palestine and the last its end. The Feast of Pentecost came at about the time when the grain harvest was completed. But "the time when thou beginnest to put the sickle to the standing grain" was seven weeks earlier, when the Passover festival was celebrated, while the vintage harvest came later and was marked by the Feast of Booths.

Of the fasts in the Jewish calendar much the most important was that of the Day of Atonement. The date

was the tenth day of the month Tishri, five days before the Feast of Tabernacles began. The special offerings for the day are prescribed in Num. 29:7-11. It is also commanded that "ye shall have a holy convocation; and ye shall afflict your souls: ye shall do no manner of work." The role played by the high priest was particularly important on this day. His duties are set forth in detail in Lev. 16:3-28. The sacrifices which he offered were first for the sins of himself and his family, and then for the sins of all his countrymen. The "scapegoat" feature of the ritual is of particular interest. For students of the New Testament the ceremonial of the Day of Atonement has interest chiefly because it forms the background of the argument of part of the Epistle to the Hebrews. (Cf. also the incidental reference in Acts 27:9.)

The Feast of Dedication, mentioned in John 10:22, commemorated the purification of the temple after its desecration by heathen sacrifices in the early Maccabean period (164 B. C.). It began on the twenty-fifth of the month Kislev (November-December) and lasted eight days. It was an occasion of joy and manifestations of patriotic pride.

Other sacred days of lesser importance require no notice here. We may remark in passing that corresponding to the weekly celebration of the Sabbath was the monthly celebration of the New Moon. Both were of ancient origin and both were provided for in the temple ritual in the New Testament period (cf. Col. 2:16).

The support of the temple and its priesthood and ritual required very considerable funds. For purchasing animals for the public sacrifices, and for meeting other temple expenses, a tax of a half-shekel (about thirty-two cents) was levied on every adult male Jew, whether living in Palestine or elsewhere. Large revenues came from this source. The time for payment was during the month Adar, the month just preceding that in which the Pass-

over occurred. After the destruction of the temple in 70 A. D. the Roman overlords diverted this tax to themselves, using the funds, as we are told, for the support of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Rome. This was presumably the situation when Matthew was written, and if so the fact may be taken as throwing light on Matt. 17:24-27. The point stressed in the passage is that Jesus felt himself free from obligation to pay the tax yet paid it rather than give offense. It is not improbable that the author in relating the incident thought thus to give guidance to his fellow-Christians who were confronted with the question of whether they should yield to the demand for the payment to a heathen power of money intended for the temple of God.

The temple had also other sources of revenue. Wood for the altar, for example, was supplied by families in turn. And in addition to the required contributions there were voluntary offerings which reached large amounts. The idea of "making merit" through such offerings was widespread in ancient times. Men of wealth and distinction—Gentiles as well as Jews—were among those who gave, while at the opposite extreme were givers like the poor widow whom Jesus commended, whose "two mites" equaled about a quarter of a cent (Mark 12:41-44).

The tithe—a tenth of all vegetable products—together with the first-born male of animals, went to the support of the priests and Levites. If the animal was "unclean," hence not usable for sacrifice and food, a money payment was made in place of it. The first-born son of each family, in like manner, had to be redeemed, the payment in this case being five shekels (about one dollar and sixty cents). Other types of offerings which were really dues paid to the support of the priesthood were the "first-fruits" and the "heave-offering." And, in the case of various other sacrifices, parts which were not

consumed in the act of sacrificing, or prescribed to be eaten by the worshiper himself, were the property of the priests. On the whole the support of the priesthood would seem to have been very well provided for. The same may be said indeed of provision for the ceremonial side of religion in general in the period after the return from exile. The Law as codified in Ezra's time gave much attention to the matter, and scribal interpretation supplemented the Law even to minute details (see *e.g.* Matt. 23:23; Lk. 11:42). The wonder is how the Jewish people were able to endure the economic burden thus imposed. It is to be remembered that they were supporting the civil government of the country and sending tribute to Rome at the same time.

It is interesting to note that Paul, though himself trained as a scribe, not a priest, and though deprecating overemphasis on form and ritual, nevertheless does not hesitate to argue that Christian ministers should be supported by the people even as were the Jewish priests. "Know ye not that they that minister about sacred things eat of the things of the temple, and they that wait upon the altar have their portion with the altar? Even so did the Lord ordain that they that proclaim the gospel should live of the gospel" (1 Cor. 9:13-14). For himself, however, Paul maintained the scribal ideal, taking no pay for his religious labors but earning his living in other ways (1 Cor. 9:15; cf. Acts 18:3).

The Founder of the Christian religion sprang from Galilee, a district of Palestine comparatively remote from Jerusalem. And after his death the lines of development which the religion followed soon led entirely away from Palestine. Moreover Jerusalem was destroyed when Christianity still was very young. Except for Paul's letters none of the New Testament writings seems to have been written until after the temple ceased to be. It is the less surprising, therefore, that the temple wor-

ship does not appear to have exerted a profound influence on the New Testament or on the development of primitive Christianity.

How influential was it actually in Judaism itself? We may allow a modern Jewish scholar to speak on this point:

> Was, then, Judaism, up till A. D. 70, a priestly religion? In one sense, yes. The Temple was loved; it was the great visible symbol of the religion. The daily and festal sacrifices were considered by everybody as of the greatest importance. For the omnipresent God was yet especially near to the Temple. The sanctuary kept God within Israel. The sacrifices atoned for Israel's sins; that was the method of national forgiveness which God had ordained, sacrifices could even atone for some sins of the individual. The Jew was proud of his one national Temple, the palladium of his one national God. . . . In one sense, then, Judaism was a priestly religion. In another and more important sense it was not. For it was a religion without sacraments or mysteries. Its priests were no longer, except accidentally, the teachers of the people. They had no absolving power. Outside Jerusalem they were of no practical account, except for the burdensome dues which had to be paid to them. Moreover, as there was only one Temple, and sacrifices could not be offered elsewhere, the whole sacrificial system played little part in everyday life or on the Sabbath day. This must have been the case a few miles radius outside Jerusalem. Beyond Judaea there must have been many Jews who never saw the Temple with its sacrificial victims (not even on the three statutory yearly occasions), and never brought an offering to the altar. The near and living institution was not the

> Temple, but the Synagogue, . . . the near and important officials were not the priests, but the scribes, the rabbis, the teachers of the Law. (Montefiore, in Peake's *Commentary,* 620.)

B. The Synagogue and Its Services.

The origin of this "near and living institution" of Judaism is obscure. It may very possibly have had its beginning during the Exile, its survival after the return and rebuilding of the temple being due to the fact that it provided for a need which temple worship did not meet. There is only a single, somewhat uncertain reference to it in the Old Testament, in Ps. 74:8, apparently dating from early in the Maccabean period. Yet notwithstanding this comparative silence on the part of Jewish writers before the New Testament period there can be no doubt that when the Gospels and Acts were written the institution already had a long history. According to Acts 15:21 the reading of the Law in the synagogue every Sabbath had been the custom "from generations of old." Josephus and Philo both traced the whole system back to Moses. They were obviously mistaken in this, but their statements show that its real origin was long previous to their own time. To Luke, and the other Gospel writers as well, teaching in the synagogue on the Sabbath day was a custom so well known that no explanatory comment was required. They refer to it frequently.

It seems probable that practically every Palestinian village had its synagogue, as had also communities outside of Palestine where there were any considerable number of Jews. In the larger towns and cities were to be found a considerable number of synagogues. This was true of Jerusalem (see Acts 6:9; 24:12); also of Alexandria and Rome. The cite chosen was sometimes outside the town, near a river or the sea. On the other

hand, the injunction of the Talmud is that the synagogue should be built on the highest point in the town. As far as the evidence goes it would seem that in Palestine, and perhaps in strong Jewish communities elsewhere, a central site within the city was preferred, while elsewhere an outside location was chosen more frequently. In the latter case the avoidance of contamination from the idol-polluted interiors of heathen cities may have been the end in view. Some idea as to the architecture of the buildings may be had from ruins excavated in Galilee, though perhaps none of these dates from a period as early as New Testament times. They were quadrangular in form. As a rule they had three entrances in the front, a large entrance in the center, and a smaller one at each side. Some were divided by rows of columns into three or five aisles. Some had a portico in front. The inside furnishings were simple. There was a platform with a reading desk, a closet or chest in which the rolls of the Scriptures were kept, seats, lamps for lighting, and horns and trumpets for blowing on festival occasions. The more distinguished members occupied front seats (cf. Mark 12:39; Luke 11:43; 20:46). Men and women presumably sat apart.

The control of the synagogue was in the hands of a body of "elders." Apparently in communities where the Jews enjoyed a large measure of self-government the elders of the community were also the elders of the synagogue, but where civil control was in the hands of non-Jews it was necessary that there should be a separate body of elders of the synagogue. The "ruler of the synagogue" (Luke 13:14, etc.) had general supervision of the building and its worship. Some synagogues may have had more than one such official (cf. Mark 5:22), or perhaps the title was retained after the term of office had expired. The "attendant" held a subordinate position analogous to that of the sexton in some branches of

the modern Christian church, his duties going somewhat beyond those of the average "janitor" (cf. Luke 4:20).

The synagogue service opened with the recitation of the "Shema," consisting of three short sections of the Law; Deut. 6:4-9; 11:13-21; Num. 15:37-41. There followed a series of "Eighteen Blessings"; prayer; two Scripture lessons, one from the Law and the other from the Prophets; a discourse based on the Scripture, or part of it. The service closed with a blessing pronounced by a priest, if one were present, otherwise with prayer. The readings of the Law followed a regular cycle, the entire Pentateuch being read through in three years; but the passage from the Prophets was left to the reader's choice. The Scripture was read from the Hebrew, but the passages were translated by an interpreter into Aramaic as they were read. Hebrew, the classical language, was little understood by the masses in New Testament times. Outside of Palestine, where Greek rather than Aramaic was the vernacular, the Septuagint no doubt was largely used. The principal service took place on the forenoon of the Sabbath day. There were shorter services in the afternoon of the Sabbath and on Mondays and Fridays, and services also on every festival day. In all services the reading of the Law was prominent.

We have seen that the synagogue had no minister, or pastor, as these terms are used in connection with the Christian church. Scripture reading, prayer, and preaching were not considered as prerogatives of a specially ordained official. On the contrary, these functions were performed by ordinary members of the congregation in turn, or, upon invitation, by a visitor. As has been suggested a scribe, whether resident or visiting, no doubt was often the preacher of the day. Jesus, as a teacher of wide reputation, though not a scribe, was often invited to speak in the synagogues. Luke (4:16ff) has preserved a record of one such occasion in some detail. Here, in

the synagogue at Nazareth, Jesus read the lesson from the Prophets and discoursed upon it. Paul, who had been educated as a scribe, made similar use of this privilege (see Acts 13:15; etc.).

The synagogue building also served other purposes. It served notably as an elementary school building. This was not unnatural or inconsistent, since the chief basis of instruction, as of worship, was the Law. Indeed it may be said that even in the regular services of worship instruction was the note most emphasized. We hear also of the building being used as a court of justice, and the New Testament provides abundant evidence of the punishment of scourging being carried out in it (Matt. 10:17; 23:34; Mark 13:9; Acts 26:11; etc.). Of course these activities, again, had their basis in the Law, which regulated civil and criminal court precedure as well as the religious life. Finally, there is evidence of the synagogue being used at times for political and social gatherings—even as a lodging place for travelers.

Yet it was in, and because of, its services of worship that the synagogue had its chief significance.

> The synagogue worship, it may be said without exaggeration, proved to be the salvation of Judaism. The religion contemplated by the Law could only have been practiced in Palestine, within easy distance of the Temple. As it was, the Jewish communities were kept together in every city and a worship was provided which could be practiced anywhere, without sanctuary sacrifice or priesthood. (Lake and Foakes-Jackson, *Beginnings of Christianity,* I, 1, 160.)

It is practiced, in cities throughout the civilized world, to this day.

The important part played by the synagogues in the launching of the Christian movement is obvious to every

reader of the New Testament. Repeatedly we read of Jesus teaching in the synagogues of Galilee, and when Paul and other early missionaries began to carry the gospel beyond the borders of Palestine the synagogues in the cities of the Empire provided a natural and invaluable point of contact with the world which they wished to reach. In a later connection we shall have more to say of this. Nor has the influence of the synagogue on Christianity been confined to the period of its beginnings. The idea of community organization for worship and related activities was taken over by the new movement in a form not greatly modified. The Christian congregation, with its weekly services, still bears unmistakably the marks of its debt to the Jewish synagogue. And it is a great debt. Doubtless Christianity has clung to some things in its heritage from Judaism which it might well have let go, but certainly this is not one of those things. With all its defects congregational worship has contributed incalculably to the power and progress of Christianity.

C. Religious Beliefs.

Jewish religion was definitely monotheistic in New Testament times. It had not always been so. The idea that as Jehovah was the god of Israel so other peoples had their tribal gods is met with frequently in the Old Testament. The development which led to a thoroughgoing monotheism, with Jehovah thought of as the one and only God of all the earth and the universe, had been gradual, but by the time of Jesus it was complete. Yet in becoming monotheistic Jewish religion did not cease to be national. Jehovah was now seen to be God of all the nations, but he was God of Israel in a special sense. To them and them only had He given a written revelation of Himself and His Will. In special favors and deliverances He had manifested

Himself to them repeatedly. They alone, on their part, gave Him the allegiance and worship which He required.

This peculiar national monotheism developed by the Jews profoundly influenced their character both as a nation and as individuals. It determined their outstanding characteristics, both for better and for worse. It tended inevitably to cause the Jew to take himself and his nation rather too seriously—to erect a barrier of self-righteousness between himself and his neighbor of another nation, a barrier which stood in the way of the achievement of a broad character and outlook and prevented him from reaching a high conception of what divine election and sonship might mean. On the other hand it made God real—made religion vital and intense—as perhaps would in no other way have been possible. Even with us, after nineteen centuries of further development, it may be questioned whether more than a small minority entertain a conception of God which is at the same time intellectually sound and religiously adequate. There is ground for believing that we are on our way to the achievement of such a synthesis. Meanwhile it has no doubt been well that the two sides should receive separate, if one-sided, emphasis. The Greeks, in particular, were at work on the problem of God's relation to the universe. They saw it in a larger and truer way than did the Jews. But what the Jews did see they saw vividly, felt keenly, experienced uniquely—the reality of God as creator, ruler, and father of men, with a relationship and claims that were particular and specific as well as general.

Again, in its conception of God's *character* Jewish religion in New Testament times embraced ideas which may seem to us contradictory. The more primitive existed side by side with the higher developments, and though there was inconsistency it was scarcely realized.

Jehovah was pure and hated impurity. He hated moral impurity, but to a large extent the conception moved on a lower plane than this, it had to do with a formal and technical purity. Mark (7:3-4) digresses from his narrative to refer, for the benefit of his non-Jewish readers, to the punctiliousness with which "the Pharisees and all the Jews" attended to "washings" of a purely formal character. Jehovah was righteous and hated unrighteousness. This, with His fatherly love, led Him to seek and try to save the erring, but it also led Him, on occasion, to take summary and awful vengeance on His enemies. The glory of Jehovah loomed large in the thought of His worshipers, and Jehovah was jealous of His glory, not only in the sense of His zeal for the goodness and truth which His name represented, but also, to some extent, as an Oriental king is jealous of his fame and prestige. Moreover it was not felt to be necessary that God should Himself manifest all the moral qualities which he required that His people should manifest. He could be the enforcer of the moral order while Himself being above and in a measure outside of it. When Jesus followed up his precept, "Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you," by declaring that God Himself acted on this principle he was giving to morality a kind of sanction which religion in general has all too seldom given to it. It is a note which is struck but rarely even in the New Testament.

Man, as over against God, was weak and sinful. There were different theories as to how he became sinful, but attempt was not made to dodge the fact, or man's responsibility for it. Of course non-Jews, and Jews who were careless about obedience to the Law, were sinners in a special sense, but even the most pious and scrupulous Israelite was conscious of being a sinner in God's sight. Man's will was free—so the Pharisees taught—but there dwelt within him an impulse to evil which ever

tended to thwart the higher impulse to do the will of God.

With such conceptions of God and of man the problem of mediation became acute. There were angels with a mediating function, and there was the Spirit of God ever working in the world of men. But in the Torah—the Law—God's people had a great and special mediator provided by God Himself. *Torah* means "teaching," and the term was applied primarily to the Pentateuch. But in use it was often made to cover the sacred writings as a whole (see *e.g.* John 10:34; 12:34; 1 Cor. 14:21, etc.), and we have seen that a great mass of scribal interpretation had become closely attached to it. In "the Law," then, was to be found not only the constitution and laws of the Jewish state and state church, with minute directions as to the conduct of individual members thereof, but much else as well. There were stories of the world's beginnings and narratives of Israel's history. There were proverbs and poems reflecting the experience of wise men and saints in the deep things of life. And all this was "teaching," given by God to His people that they might thoroughly know His will and in doing it find prosperity and happiness.

Thus though God, on the one hand, was thought of as far transcending sinful man, yet, on the other hand, He Himself had made elaborate provision by which His people might gain access to Him. In so doing He had shown Himself to be a loving and compassionate God, and emphasis on this side of His character was by no means lacking on the part of Jewish thinkers and saints. The possibility of repentance, the readiness of the Divine forgiveness, the efficacy of prayer—all were prominent in Jewish religious belief. God's fatherhood was not *central* in the teaching of the Law and of the rabbis as it was in Jesus' teaching, but it is a mistake to suppose that it had no place.

Hope for the future was another important element in the Jewish religious outlook. Belief in Jehovah's universal sovereignty lay at the very heart of the religion, yet over against this belief was ever the fact that His *actual* sovereignty—or at least the obvious manifestation of it—was limited. The belief could scarcely have maintained itself apart from a hope, an assurance, that Jehovah's sovereignty would yet, at some future time, be as universal in fact as it now was in theory. Again, there was a similar discrepancy between the theory of Israel as the Chosen People of the God of all the earth and the fact of her subordinate, even downtrodden and despised, position among the nations. Here too the belief could be maintained only through the power of an ever-living hope in a time of glory and triumph yet to be. Naturally the hope, engendered in one or both of these ways, assumed various forms. In some circles it concerned itself mainly with a glorified, though earthly, kingdom of Israel. But the thoughts and dreams of others went farther afield. Apparently influenced more or less by Persian beliefs, they saw God vindicating His sovereignty in the future in ways more stupendous than merely by a restoration of temporal power to Israel. The present evil world or "age" would come to a cataclysmic end, and a new age, "revealed" from God Himself, would be ushered in. There would be a resurrection of the dead and a universal judgment, evil men and nations being condemned to torment and the good rewarded with blessings and delights in the "coming age."

It would seem that by some a combination between the narrower and broader types of hope for the future was made by placing the one before the other in time. There would be a limited period of national glory for Israel after which the Coming Age, in the larger sense, would be ushered in. There was no settled doctrine as to the length of the interim period. In the work known

as 4 Ezra it is put at four hundred years. In 2 Enoch, however, it is a thousand-year period. This latter view was adopted by the author of Revelation (20:1-10), and thus the idea of a "millenium" found its way into Christianity. Its basis was found in an interpretation of the creation story of Genesis as predictive, and of Ps. 90:4 as providing the key to its meaning. The six days of creation forecasted six thousand years of history, while the seventh day of rest forecasted a thousand years, at the end of the age, in which God's people would enjoy repose and happiness.

Belief in a resurrection of the dead, referred to above, was one of the newer elements in Jewish faith. In the time of Jesus many Jews, notably the Sadducees, still did not hold to it (see *e.g.* Mark 12:18; Acts 23:8). Its rise was due to the fact that from the exile period on interest in God's relation to the individual—as over against His interest in the nation—had been forcing itself to the front. Thus the visions of a glorious new Jewish kingdom, or of a Coming Age in which Jehovah's sovereignty would be acknowledged by all, lacked a good deal of being satisfactory so long as no provision was made for rewarding the good and punishing the evil who died before the great Day came. According to the generally accepted Hebrew view these, good and evil alike, went to Sheol, where there was existence and not much else—a shadowy and very unsatisfactory half-life (see *e.g.* Job 7:7-10; Ps. 6:5). In the Old Testament there are a very few passages in which the hope of in some way escaping Sheol is expressed (see Job 14:13-15; Ps. 49:15), and a couple of late passages in which the more concrete idea of a resurrection emerges. In the earlier of these two passages (Is. 26:19) only the resurrection of the righteous is in view; in the later (Dan. 12:2) not only the righteous are to rise for reward but also the wicked

for punishment. In this latter form the doctrine had won general acceptance on the part of Pharisaic Judaism in New Testament times, and thus it passed over into Christianity. It was a comforting and strengthening doctrine to people living under oppression, with not infrequent martyrdoms.

The figure of a Messiah was not as prominent, or as clearly defined, as has sometimes been supposed. In some of the passages having to do with the future, in Jewish writings, a divinely appointed leader plays an important role; in others such a figure appears but is not made prominent, while elsewhere God in His own person assumes the leadership. Where the hope was mainly of the narrower national type it seems to have been pretty generally expected that a hero leader of the line of David would arise. Some, however, looked rather to the house of Aaron, the priestly family. The Maccabees belonged to this family, and the descendants of Herod the Great, through his wife Mariamne, were of priestly blood. Thus the successful leadership actually exercised by this house led at times to the hope being focused upon it (cf. Ps. 110). But on the whole the "scion of David" idea (Jer. 23:5; 33:15) maintained itself. On the other hand, the broader type of hope required a different Messianism, if it had any at all. Where what was expected was not a glorified kingdom, made possible by sweeping Jewish victory, but rather a completely new world prepared and revealed by God Himself; a Messiah either had no part in the picture or else appeared with the new order as a preëxistent demigod, Jehovah's vicegerent. It was this latter conception that was destined to most influence Christianity. But in our efforts to understand just what the disciples of Jesus meant when they called him "the Messiah" it is well to remember that the word is primarily an adjec-

tive, meaning "anointed"—*i.e.* consecrated by God—and that its use by the Jews in Jesus' time as a title had not become as standardized as is often assumed.

Before closing this brief sketch of Jewish religious beliefs we must note that to the Jews, as to ancient peoples in general, the spirit world was very real. Beings of a higher order than men though subordinate to God peopled the heavens and had ready access to the world of men. Their influence on human life was partly good, as in the case of guardian angels, and partly baneful, as in the case of the demons who manifested themselves in malignant sickness or insanity. But for good and for ill the sum total of this influence was as enormous as it was inescapable. It is needless to say that this spiritism was carried over into early Christianity. We find it throughout the New Testament.

The world view of Jews of the first century was of course utterly different from ours, and this applies to highly educated Jews like Philo or Paul as well as to the ignorant. The earth was stationary and flat—an extended area of solid matter floating on a primeval sea. Under it was a region peopled by the dead and by evil spirits. Above was a bell-shaped vault with doors, and above this was heaven, with God, the angels, and a few select humans as inhabitants. The distance from earth to heaven was short—angels could make the journey easily. Satan and his subject demons in like manner could easily come up on to the earth and into the air. Details were subject to variation, particularly to elaboration (cf. the "third heaven" of 2 Cor. 12:2; also Eph. 4:9-10; Luke 16:19-31), but the general features stand out with striking distinctness in contrast with our view. Almost nothing was known of our astronomy, geology, or anthropology. The Jew's view of the universe in New Testament times was constructed in the light of the Genesis story of creation and of what his own limited

observation seemed to teach him. And his world-view colored his religious beliefs in no small degree, though religion in its essence may truly be said to be independent of cosmology.

We have already seen, at many points, how Jewish beliefs are reflected in the New Testament. The extent of the influence—and how other currents mingled with and modified this one—will appear more fully farther on. To say that Judaism in New Testament times was a legalistic religion is true but somewhat misleading. It is misleading because it is hard for us to appreciate all that the term Law, or rather Torah, meant to the Jew of Jesus' time. The religion of the writer of the long 119th Psalm was obviously legalistic: Jehovah's "law," "commandments," "precepts," "ordinances" are ever to the fore. But it was just as obviously a *real* religion, not formal merely, but proceeding from the inmost heart and coloring all of life. It seems clear that Jesus, in making God's fatherhood central, and Paul, in the mystical passion with which he dwelt upon "faith" and "grace," marked a real and definite revolt against tendencies in the Pharisaism of their day; but we are not to suppose that Jesus and Paul took their stand wholly upon the faith of the prophets of earlier centuries, rejecting in toto the religion of the Pharisees. Such certainly was not the case. The Judaism of the period is much better known now than it was a few decades ago, and in the light of this fuller knowledge its direct and positive influence on the Christian movement which grew out of it has been brought into clearer light.

CHAPTER XIV

THE HELLENISTIC BACKGROUND: CULTURAL

A. Hellenism.

Judaism and Hellenism—these two forces constitute the cultural and religious background of primitive Christianity. Judaism was not exactly a simple phenomenon, as we have seen, and Hellenism was even more complex. To begin with, the distinction between the terms Hellenic and Hellenistic must be understood. The former is applied to the civilization of Greece proper, which reached its flower some centuries before the period of our present interest; the latter to a related yet modified type of culture which spread over the lands about the eastern shore of the Mediterranean following the conquests of Alexander the Great. The modification was due in part to the lapse of time, but even more to the fusion of Greek culture with that of other lands. The Greek element remained dominant, yet naturally some traces of the absorbed cultures survived. Hellenistic civilization, then—the civilization of a great part of the Roman Empire in New Testament times—was dominantly Greek but was affected by Oriental and Roman influences in greater or less degree. It would be convenient, and conducive to clearness, if such a term as "Hellenicism" were in general use as applied to this later culture as distinguished from the earlier, more purely Greek. Lacking such a term, "Hellenism" is used of both. But where the background of the New Testament is the subject under discussion it will usually be found

that the noun Hellenism, as well as the adjective Hellenistic, refers mainly to the fused, Graeco-Roman-Oriental, civilization which had long since permeated the world into which the New Testament, and the religion of the New Testament, had to make their way. Such will be our usage here.

The extent to which the use of the Greek language had spread is remarkable. It had become the common medium of intercourse around the eastern Mediterranean and had spread even farther afield. In many places east of the Euphrates it was understood, while in Egypt farmers and tradespeople were transacting business and carrying on correspondence in Greek. It was both spoken and written by educated Romans even in the city of Rome. Latin of course was the dominant language in the capital, yet it is noteworthy that early Christian writings connected with Rome—whether sent to the city, as Paul's epistle to the Romans, or from it, as the epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians—were not written in Latin but in Greek. Even Jewish exclusiveness was penetrated. As early as the middle or latter part of the third century B. C. the sacred Torah had been rendered into Greek in Egypt, and the use of this version (the Septuagint) by Jews outside of Palestine rapidly became general. The Bible of the first generations of Christians was the Greek Old Testament, a fact which made it the easier for a new collection of distinctively Christian writings in time to take its place beside the Jewish collection as a "New" Testament.

Thus Hellenism served Christianity in providing a universal language as a medium for its missionary activities and for the production and advance in prestige of its sacred books. But the influence by no means ended here. The world which spoke the Greek language was permeated also with Hellenistic customs, institutions, ideas, and habits of thought. Christianity was thrust

out into this world very early in its history, and from this time forward Hellenism rather than Judaism was the dominant factor in its cultural and religious environment. In this chapter and the one following we shall note some of the outstanding features of this new environment.

B. Industry, Commerce, and Travel.

The age was one of great industrial and commercial activity, in spite of the fact that many things which seem to us essential to an industrial civilization had yet to wait long centuries for their discovery. The unprecedented peace which marked the reign of Augustus, and the administrative reforms which that emperor introduced, paved the way for a great increase in trade and in general prosperity. In this respect the age has been likened to that which followed the Napoleonic wars in Europe or the American Civil War. Great business houses, on the one hand, and unions of craftsmen, on the other, existed as in modern times. The congestion of population in large cities and a sharpening of the line between rich and poor were other features common to both the Hellenistic civilization and our own.

Travel seems to have been almost a mania. Commercial activities were responsible for much, but not all of it. The world was open and safe as it had never been before, and men were disposed to take advantage of the situation. Passports apparently were not required, nor even evidences of Roman citizenship. Highwaymen were sometimes to be met with on land and pirates on the sea, yet "it may be said without exaggeration that during the first two centuries of our era one could travel in Mediterranean lands over a wider area and with greater security than it has ever been possible to do since" (C. H. Moore, in Lake and Foakes-Jackson, *Beginnings of Christianity,* I, 1, 230). Merchants and

their agents traveled on business, officials and soldiers on government missions, pilgrims on their way to and from religious shrines and oracles, healers, musicians, actors and athletes in pursuit of their several arts, tourists journeying to the Pyramids and other places of fame or interest, sick people in search of health, and lecturers on philosophy and religion eager to give their panaceas to the world. Such figures as those of Paul and his missionary companions were by no means unfamiliar in the provinces of the empire which they visited.

All this made for a culture that was broader—whatever else may be said of it—than that into which Christianity had been born. The new environment was as markedly cosmopolitan in outlook as the old had been markedly national.

C. Classes of Society.

We shall speak first of the slaves. They formed a large proportion of the total population, though just how large it is impossible to say This prominence of the slave class is one of the most striking features of the social organization of the Roman Empire, and a feature of sinister significance. The wars which had accompanied the expansion and consolidation of the Empire had resulted in swelling the ranks of the slaves enormously. Not only prisoners of war but the inhabitants of captured cities, men, women, and children, belonged to the conqueror. They were a part of the booty and were sold to the slave-traders who followed the armies. Captives taken by pirates and brigands were added to the number, while children born of female slaves were held in slavery. The slaves were of almost every country and race—Greeks, Orientals, Africans, Gauls, Teutons, Slavs. And the tasks they performed were not less varied. They were laborers in the fields, herdsmen, and shepherds. They furnished man power for the hand-mills

with which the grain was ground, labor of a particularly deadening sort. In the domestic establishment of a rich city-dweller would sometimes be found hundreds of slaves—cooks and waiters, personal attendants, slaves of the wardrobe, slaves of the bath, slaves to take care of the furniture and slaves to have charge of the silver plate, litter-bearers, coachmen, grooms, readers and secretaries, musicians and actors. The household of a rich Roman was a little world practically sufficient unto itself. It was likely to include not only shoemakers, tailors, carpenters, and masons, but nurses, tutors, physicians, and surgeons as well. Many of the most highly cultured men of the Empire were slaves.

The slave belonged to his master absolutely. He had nothing that he could call his own, no rights, theoretically no soul, no duty but to obey. Under such a system the treatment of slaves naturally varied with the character of the master. The lot of multitudes was indescribably wretched, especially those who toiled in the fields and at the mills. On the other hand, household slaves were often treated almost as members of the family. Many of them were given their freedom, and not infrequently a master left part or all of his property to a favorite slave. The literature of the period reveals frequent instances of the warmest affection existing between master and slave.

Freedmen formed another large class. Various considerations—affection, financial exigencies, etc.—might lead masters to free their slaves or allow them to purchase their freedom. Many of the freedmen engaged in commercial pursuits—in "business," as we would say—and amassed great fortunes. This was the more possible from the fact that the aristocratic class deemed such pursuits beneath them, while the plebeians, as a class, lacked the freedman's initiative and ability. Not a few ambitious freedmen found a fruitful field for their talents in poli-

tics. They frequently held important posts under the emperors, both in Rome and in the provinces. Under Claudius the empire was largely ruled by two freedmen favored by the emperor, Pallus and Narcissus. Felix, the procurator before whom Paul was first taken at Caesarea, was a brother of Pallas and himself also of the freedman class. The prejudice against freedmen on the part of nobles and plebeians alike was great, but many of them succeeded in spite of it. Their ill-repute was doubtless due in part to envy, but it was not entirely undeserved. They often displayed both the absurdities of the newly rich and the vices of the degraded slave, as the literary satirists of the time—such as Juvenal and Petronius—were fond of pointing out. Many of the freed slaves, of course, were less successful. These helped to fill up the ranks of the pauper class.

The plebeians—common people—were in some respects the most unfortunately situated of all. There was little demand for paid labor, whether skilled or unskilled, on account of the multitude of slaves. Business occupations, too, were largely monopolized by freedmen and slaves. Thus plebeians and the less fortunate freedmen combined to form a rabble which was a ready tool in the hands of scheming villains and formed a serious menace to society. Yet there must have been much good material in these classes. In such a social system it was inevitable that many individuals would be pressed down and kept down who, given a fair chance, would have made upright and useful citizens.

There were, finally, the aristocrats—descendants of old families of nobles or knights, or persons who in other ways had inherited a status of privilege. This class also suffered from the baneful influence of slavery. Idleness, cruelty, dissolute living were fostered; the strength which went with the old Roman simplicity was in a large measure lost. And the results were serious. This class, not-

withstanding the rise of the freedmen, was still in the main the ruling class, and the weakening of its intellectual and moral fiber augured badly for the future of the empire and the civilization which the empire upheld.

We shall see later that the Hellenistic world of this period was a very religious world. And one of the reasons is before us now. However religion be defined, *a sense of need* lies close to the heart of it, and certainly among the classes which formed a great majority of the population of the empire a sense of need—a feeling that life was too big a proposition for unaided human powers —was widespread. The social situation made this inevitable. And if the situation created a receptive attitude toward religion in general it was particularly favorable to the progress of Christianity, that is, to its progress among the classes which were more or less submerged. "Not many of you were . . . influential, not many were of high birth," Paul writes to the Christians of Corinth. Here and elsewhere, we gather, there were slaves, freedmen, and plebians among the converts, but very few aristocrats. To men and women of the lower classes the exalted spiritual experience which came to them from the new faith must have gone far toward lightening the drudgery of daily life (see 1 Cor. 12-14; etc.), while the assurance that the near future held for them a life of glory and privilege made the endurance of present hardships the easier (see 2 Cor. 4:16-18; 1 Pet. 1:3-7; Rev. 3:11-12; 21:7). We must assume, too, that the Christian ideal of love, compassion, and sympathy, however imperfectly realized in practice, made a strong appeal in a world which, for all its brilliance, was hard and cruel.

D. Philosophy.

The word philosophy must here be understood in a broader, and at the same time more practical, sense than is usual with us. It was used of inquiry into the

origin and underlying principles of things, but since Plato and Aristotle this had no longer been its chief field of use. Philosophy was concerning itself less with creative thought and more with the concrete problems of life. It had become less metaphysical and more ethical. It was trying to provide "a medicine for the soul"—to show man his proper place in the universe, to teach him how to live. The position of the philosopher, in the non-Jewish world, was roughly analogous to that of the Jewish scribe.

Of the several philosophical "schools" we may speak first of the *Epicureans.* This school was founded at Athens by Epicurus in 307 B. C. Its period of greatest prestige was perhaps between 100 B. C. and 50 A. D. By the latter date it was beginning to decline, and by the second century of our era its doctrines no longer had widespread appeal. According to the teaching of the Epicureans there are two kinds of substance in the universe and only two: material bodies and the void in which those bodies operate. The material bodies are atoms, and these all have the same composition, though they vary in size. It is through the combination of these atoms that the different forms of matter arise. Heavier ones press together and form solids. Water, fire, air, ether, are formed by lighter ones. Thus, on the theoretical side, the philosophy was purely materialistic, and saw the universe as entirely a product of chance. There were gods, but they had nothing to do either with creation or with man's destiny. They were perfectly happy beings who dwelt in the ethereal regions between the innumerable worlds, being formed of the finest atoms in the likeness of men. They did not demand worship. They had no desires in the matter whatever. Nevertheless it was for man's good to worship them, because they were the perfect embodiment of happiness, and happiness was man's highest end.

Epicurus believed that his philosophy greatly ennobled the conception of the gods which was generally current, and had in general an emancipating and unlifting influence on life. And it would seem that he was not entirely wrong, at least as regards the teaching and practice of the philosophy by himself and the best of his followers. Certainly credit should be given to Epicureanism for its serious effort to combat the dense superstition which was so rife in the Graeco-Roman world. We who know only the western civilization of the twentieth century have little idea of what a burden life can be made by the prevalence of belief in a world full of more or less malignant demons and jealous deities. Epicurus swept all this away at one stroke for those who became his followers.

It is commonly supposed that according to Epicurean doctrine the pursuit of pleasure was the highest end to which man could devote himself. This is in a sense true, but it should be understood that Epicurus himself and the worthier ones among his disciples defined pleasure and happiness in terms of life as a whole, not merely in sensual terms. Immorality therefore was to be shunned, not because it was prohibited by any law or because indulgence in it would bring punishment, but because it was detrimental to one's real interests, a hindrance to the attainment of real pleasure, real happiness.

Such doctrines as those of Epicurus, as will readily be seen, were likely to be abused and perverted. It was the fate of this school as of others to number among its adherents men who had little capacity for appreciating its lofty ideals and principles and who made philosophy a cloak for boorishness and sensuality. Yet it is clear that in so far as Epicureanism was leavening the society of the Mediterranean world its leaven was not wholly a leaven of unrighteousness.

The *Stoics* were much the most influential of all the schools at the time when the Christian movement was

being launched. The founder was Zeno, a native of Cyprus who taught in Athens at about the same time as Epicurus. Other noted Stoics were Cleanthes, Chrysippus, Panaetius, Seneca, Epictetus, and the emperor Marcus Aurelius. The Stoic agreed with the Epicurean in holding the ultimate reality in the universe to be matter but when it came to defining the nature of this matter the two parted company. The Epicurean, as we have seen, gave to it only the power of purposeless motion, so that the universe was ruled by chance. The Stoic, on the other hand, endowed matter with a quality which he called "reason" (*Logos*), and so was able to maintain that all things happen by design. It was this rational yet material force, permeating all things, which the Stoic acknowledged as deity. Stoicism was therefore monistic and pantheistic. It conceived of God not as standing apart from the world and from humanity—as the Epicureans pictured their gods—but as the essential, life-giving element in the world and in humanity. The universe, nature, God—these are one and the same. And man's soul is a spark of the world-soul; man is a fragment of God.

From this underlying philosophy was derived the fundamental principle of Stoic ethics: "to live in accord with nature," *i.e.* to resist the passions, which lead men to act contrary to reason, and so live on a lofty plane of equanimity, superior to the vicissitudes which mar men's happiness. Our word "nature" is indeed a somewhat misleading translation of the Stoic term (φύσις). To us living according to nature is likely to mean living on a sensual plane, but what the Stoics meant by the phrase was something very different from this. Their term literally means "process of growth," and its use was akin to the use of the term "evolution" with us. To subdue the passions—to seek good in the larger sense rather than to pursue that which for the

moment or from a selfish point of view might seem to be good—this is "living in accord with nature" in the sense that it is helping and furthering the great Purpose back of things.

The ideal life to the Stoic was that of the "wise man" (σοφός) who, living in accord with the evolving Purpose, had attained *apatheia, i.e.* calmness, dispassionateness, mastery.

> Health, comfort, pleasure, physical well-being and the like are quite indifferent. . . . A good governor, for instance, tries to make his province healthy and prosperous, not sick and poverty-stricken. That is the way to be a good governor. It is his business, his τέχνη or Art, to do so, and if necessary to die or suffer torments rather than fail in attaining these ends. Yet as a matter of philosophic truth, such ends are in themselves of no importance. They are just like counters in a game, the good player will try to win as many counters as possible, but he knows all the while that the counters have only a fictitious value. It is not they that matter ultimately, in eternity, at the Last Judgment, so to speak. Suppose for instance the good man is in an agony of pain, he will suffer in the body, he may even weep and groan; but "inside he should not groan." Similarly, suppose he hears of a city on fire. He will do everything possible to save it; he will, of course, give his life, if that is required. But suppose at the end of all his efforts, the city is burned, what will be his state of mind? Of course he will suffer; he may weep and lament; but, in so far as he is really wise, 'inside he should not groan.' He will retain inside him some central part which does not weep but accepts the will of God. (Gilbert Murray, in Peake's *Commentary,* 634.)

This is likely to appear to us to be cold, impersonal, selfish doctrine, yet as understood and practiced by the great Stoic masters it was not so—at least not nearly as much so as we would probably think. The Stoic world-view carried with it not only the principle of living in accord with nature and the ideal of dispassionateness, but another, not less characteristic, doctrine, that of *the sympathy of the universe* (συυπαθεία τῶν ὅλων), which involved a deep sense of human brotherhood.

> Since the Providence and Love of God runs through all the created universe, and in fact expresses itself therein, it follows that all the universe is akin; thus the suffering or joy, the good or evil, of any one part is somehow felt in every other part. The stars shiver in their orbits for mortal suffering or sin; and if a particular man does not care for the sufferings of his distant fellow-creatures, that is because he is blindly isolating himself and refusing to be what God intended him to be, a part of the divine whole. (*Ibid.*)

Stoicism was far from being irreligious. Toward the polytheism of the masses its teachers took different attitudes. In the main the tendency was to allegorize the stories of the gods, thus making them as useful and edifying as possible. Some of the Stoics, however, took a more thoroughly skeptical attitude. But in any case there was the divine Logos to be reverenced, worshiped, and obeyed. And although in theory the Logos was material it was constantly thought of and spoken of as personal—as Zeus, God, a Being to whom men might pray and with whom they might have deep and satisfying fellowship.

The *Cynics* were a less numerous school closely related to the Stoics. They were of earlier origin, their founder, Antisthenes, having been a pupil of Socrates. The use of the word *cynic,* or *cynical,* with us conveys

no accurate idea of the characteristics of Cynic philosophy. It has been called "a rougher, ruder Stoicism," though it would be rather more accurate to speak of Stoicism as Cynicism polished and intellectualized. The Cynic and the Stoic agreed in holding that most of the things about which men agitate themselves do not really matter, but the Cynic was more agressive and violent than the Stoic in his allegiance to that creed. He devoted himself to

> a whole-hearted war against the vanities of the world; first against vice, but also against wealth, rank, culture, learning, politeness, and every form of convention. The true cynic reduced his needs to a minimum; he would have liked to live as a dog lives (Κυνικῶς), with no apparatus at all. Being a man he needed a blanket to keep off the cold, and a stick to keep off biting dogs and fools. For a shelter the famous Diogenes slept in an enormous earthen jar, the kind that in early days was used for coffins. The Cynics were street preachers and fearless missionaries in the haunts of vice. The passionate and stinging eloquence of their sermons or *Diatribae* has left a deep mark on later Greek philosophy and early Christian preaching. Doubtless the thoroughgoing Cynic must have been an unpleasant person, when he was not actually an impostor; and we hear that he was sometimes both. But as an influence in ancient life Cynicism had a rare value, especially in situations where mere incorruptible courage was more needed than delicacy of preception or feeling. (*Ibid.*)

The *Academy,* a philosophical school which counted Plato as its master, and the *Lyceum,* owing allegiance to Aristotle, had suffered decline, and were only minor factors in the thought life of this period. Yet many who

counted themselves Stoics or Epicureans were influenced by ideas sponsored by these older schools. The fact is that eclecticism was characteristic of the thought of the time. The Roman tendency was to seize upon and make use of whatever was found to be practically useful no matter whence it came, and this point of view had largely influenced the current philosophy. Seneca, for example, ranks as one of the great Stoics, yet when we peruse his *Epistulae Morales* we find him referring repeatedly to Epicurus, to whom he owed a great and fully conscious debt, and speaking with respect and affection of the Cynic Demetrius. It is a mistake to assume that the various schools were separated from each other by distinct and rigid dividing lines.

Philosophy was brought into contact with the world's life in various ways. One way was through the universities, of which the most famous were located at Alexandria, Athens, Tarsus, and Rhodes. Another was through public lectures and private tutoring on the part of individual teachers of philosophy. A wealthy household often included able teachers among its slaves. Wandering preachers set forth Cynic and Stoic ideas—in more or less crude form—on the streets. This practice, indeed, was carried so far as to become a nuisance, tending to bring the very name of philosophy into disrepute. Elementary instruction seems to have been available even in small communities, and the ability to read and write was widespread. Yet there was no system of education at all comparable with that of one of the civilized nations of modern times. Unfortunately the Roman genius for organization did not apply itself here. In fact the appearance of a rich intellectual and cultural life under the empire was deceptive. The culture was in the main inherited, particularly from the Greeks of earlier centuries. It was imitative and stagnant rather than creative and forward-reaching, and no serious effort

was made to diffuse it among the rank and file. Yet this cultural heritage possessed by the Hellenistic world was of priceless value, different from but not less great than that possessed by the Jews in the same period. And fortunately, through the guidance of Providence, the former as well as the latter was destined to survive in Christianity.

In modern times a vast amount of study has been devoted to the subject of the relation between early Christianity and contemporary philosophy. The teachings of Stoicism, in particular, have been compared with those of the New Testament, special attention being given to the seeming affinity, at many points, of Seneca and Paul. It is indeed easy to recall sentences and phrases from Paul's writings which have the Stoic ring. Thus, in the true Stoic spirit, he writes to the Philippians: "Not that I speak in respect of want: for I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therein to be content. I know how to be abased, and I know also how to abound: in everything and in all things have I learned the secret both to be filled and to be hungry, both to abound and to be in want. I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me. Howbeit ye did well that ye had fellowship with my affliction . . ." (Phil. 4:11-14). Again, he describes himself "as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things" (2 Cor. 6:9-10).

A different sort of parallelism is seen when we turn to such familiar sayings of Paul's as the following: ". . . so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another" (Rom. 12:5); "For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free, and were all made

to drink of one Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:13); "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female, for you are all one man in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28). Says Seneca: "We are members of a vast body. Nature made us kin, when she produced us from the same things and to the same ends" (*Ep. Mor.* 95:52); "I will look upon all lands as belonging to me, and my own lands as belonging to all" (*De Vit.* 20); "Virtue is barred to none: she is open to all, she receives all, she invites all, gentlefolk, freedmen, slaves, kings, exiles alike" (*De Benef.* 3:18); "Nature bids us assist *men;* and whether they be bond or free, whether gentlefolk or freedmen, whether they enjoy liberty as a right or as a friendly gift, what matter? Wherever a *man* is, there is room for doing good" (*De Vit.* 24); "This mind may belong as well to a Roman knight, as to a freedman, as to a slave: for what is a Roman knight or a freedman or a slave? Names which had their origin in ambition or injustice" (*Ep. Mor.* 31:11). It was easy and natural for Paul, at Athens, to claim common ground with the philosophers in the matter of belief in God's immanence and man's brotherhood (Acts 17:24-28).

We may quote a few further sentences from Seneca which recall rather strikingly the Sermon on the Mount: "And unless the soul be pure and holy, there is no room in it for God" (*Ep. Mor.* 87:21); "A man is a robber even before he stains his hands; for he is already armed to slay, and has the desire to spoil and to kill" (*De Benef.* 5:14; cf. *De Const.* Sap. 7); "Cast out whatsoever things rend thy heart: nay, if they could not be extracted otherwise, thou shouldst have plucked out thy heart itself with them" (*Ep. Mor.* 51:13); "I will be agreeable to friends, gentle and yielding to enemies" (*De Otio.* 28:1); "Apply thyself rather to the true riches. It is

shameful to depend for a happy life on silver and gold" (*Ep. Mor.* 110:18); "Let us so give as we would wish to receive" (*De Benef.* 2:1).

The above lists could be greatly extended, particularly if Epictetus, not to mention other philosophers, were included in the reckoning. It is not surprising that Christian writers of the second century and after should have regarded the Stoic doctrine of the Logos as an "anticipation" of Christianity, or that Jerome should have made reference to "our own Seneca." Yet there were differences, not less significant than the resemblances. Christian teachers could on occasion, like the Stoics, dwell upon God's immanence in His world and in humanity, but belief in His transcendance had at least as great weight with them. With this went the fact that to the Christian, as to the Jew, external revelation—not reason or the inner voice—was in theory the source of the highest truth. Again, there was no place in Stoicism for such a belief in a future life as that of Christianity. Reabsorption of the human life into the all-pervading Logos from which it had sprung was the best that it could consistently offer to its devotees. And it is not hard to see that Stoic ethics, in spite of parallels, had a different basis from the ethics of Christianity. The Stoic basis was more intellectual, more calculating. To do good because it was the *sensible* thing to do, would in the long run produce the best results for *oneself*—this may be said, without unfairness, to have been the Stoic ideal. There was in Stoicism a self-centeredness—and a self-sufficiency—quite foreign to Christianity. Seneca was not insensible to sin, yet one cannot imagine his crying, with Paul, "I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7:18).

We have to remind ourselves that Stoicism, notwithstanding its moral and religious aspects, was after all not a religion but a philosophy. It may aid in the com-

parison if we describe Stoicism as a philosophy with strong religious and ethical interests, and Christianity as a religion with strong intellectual and ethical interests. And this way of putting the matter will help us to understand what Hellenistic philosophy—Stoicism in particular—did for Christianity. It undoubtedly influenced Christianity's development along ethical lines, but this can scarcely be considered a vital influence, since the new religion, as an offshoot of Judaism, already had a strong ethical bent. More vital and far-reaching was the influence on the intellectual side. Systematic thought was not specially characteristic of the Jews. In the thoroughgoing use of the reasoning faculty the Greeks were far ahead of them. And it was here—both for worse and for better—that the Christianity of later centuries was destined to be deeply marked by its Greek heritage. Already in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel we see conceptions of Greek philosophy called to the service of the developing Christian theology. The fathers of the second and third centuries continued the work, and early in the fourth century we find a Christianity which has been thoroughly intellectualized, worked into a system of thought embracing metaphysics and cosmology as well as the problem of salvation for man. We may call this a misfortune if we choose. Certainly nothing can be more fatal to a religion than for it to be over-intellectualized. But the more serious misfortune, we may suspect, has been the tendency of the later generations to give fixity to what the early fathers worked out—to regard it as final and unchangeable. If too much of the intellectual is a menace to religion too little is not less so, and credit should be given to the Greek element in Christianity's heritage for helping to preserve the balance in this respect. Even in this enlightened age it does not appear that the Christian church has a surplus of trained intelligence.

E. Hellenism and the Jewish "Dispersion."

The term "sojurners" may be aptly applied to the Hebrew race at almost any period of its history (see Lake and Foakes-Jackson, *op. cit.* I, 1, 137). Before the settlement in Canaan the sons of Israel were wandering tribes, and their possession of a distinctive homeland in subsequent centuries was less true in fact than in theory. Galilee, for example, remained largely foreign. In the Old Testament it is referred to as "Galilee of the Gentiles" (Is. 9:1), and when Jesus, during his ministry in Galilee, sent his disciples into neighboring districts to preach to his countrymen, he found it advisable to give them explicit instructions to avoid routes of travel which led to towns occupied by foreigners (Matt. 10:5, 6, 23). Josephus supplies further evidence of a large foreign population in Palestine.

The Jews, then, were in a real sense a "Dispersion" even in what we think of as their homeland, but the term is applied more particularly to Jewish settlements outside of Palestine (see John 7:35; James 1:1; 1 Pet. 1:1). Various exigencies had led to the founding of such settlements. Some of them owed their origin to deportations which followed wars of conquest by Assyrian and Babylonian kings (see 2 Kings 15:29; 17:6; 18:11; 24:14-16; 25:11; cf. Jer. 43:4-7). In addition to these movements *en masse* large numbers of Jews, taken as prisoners of war, had been sold as slaves and so transported into various parts of the world. In other cases commercial activities led to the founding of colonies (cf. 1 Kings 20:34). The instinct to seek their fortune through business enterprises led Jews far afield in ancient times as it does to-day. No doubt in some cases desire for greater cultural advantages led to migration, as did also the wish to escape from the turbulent conditions which so often prevailed in Palestine (see Wade, *New Testament History,* 77).

We get some idea from Acts 2:5-11 of how widespread the Jewish Dispersion was. The Jews present at this feast of Pentecost are said to have come from regions as remote from each other as the Parthian Empire, Media, Elam, Mesopotamia, and Arabia in the East, Egypt and Cyrene in Africa, and Rome in Italy, not to mention the island of Crete and the Roman provinces of Asia Minor. From other references in the New Testament and elsewhere, Syria (especially Antioch and Damascus), Cyprus, Greece, and Macedonia may be added to the list. The total number of Jews thus spread over the world is hard to estimate. Philo thought that there were about a million in Egypt in his time (first century A. D.) There may have been as many as six or seven million in all the countries, including Palestine (see Lake and Foakes-Jackson, *op. cit.* I, 1, 159).

In general the attitude of the Roman government toward the Jews of these numerous colonies was tolerant. There was a long-established precedent for such an attitude, as was not the case with the Christians, when they began to be viewed with suspicion by the government. Josephus (*Ant.* 14:8, 10, 12; 16:6) quotes a series of enactments, under Julius Caesar and Augustus, which granted to the Jews religious freedom, exemption from military service, special rights in the administration of property, and special rights in exercising legal jurisdiction over members of their own race. From references in Acts it would appear that this jurisdiction applied to criminal cases as well as civil, though Josephus cannot be cited as authority for this (see Acts 9:2; 18:12-17) These rights were violated at times by local authorities, and occasionally even emperors sanctioned measures of an oppressive sort, yet on the whole the position of the Jews in the empire was a favored one.

The unofficial attitude of Gentiles toward Jews in their midst varied greatly, just as it does to-day. "The

uneducated masses scoffed at the Jews for their outlandish customs, plundered them at all hands, and occasionally gave expression to their hatred in massacres" (Guthe, in Ency. Biblica, I, 1115). Yet

> there were many points of friendly contact between Judaism and the outer world. For the more educated circles of the Gentile world the Judaism of the Diaspora had, in fact, a great attraction. In it men felt themselves face to face with a power which had developed new forces—unflinching self-sacrificing fidelity in the maintenance of religious customs which seemed to the outsider meaningless—sabbath observance, circumcision, laws of purity. Through Judaism they became acquainted with a conception of God which, strange in its severity, enlightened by its simplicity, and attracted religious natures by its purity and its sincerity." (*Ibid.* 1116.)

The attitude of the Jews toward the Hellenistic culture showed similar diversity. In the case of some the new contacts simply intensified the old loyalty. They set themselves to resist the seductions of the new world in which they found themselves, and so maintained a Judaism which, in its zeal for the Law and adherence to Pharisaic principles and practices, could compete with the strictest Judaism of Palestine. But with many—probably with a majority of the better minds—such intellectual and spiritual seclusion was not possible. The case of Philo of Alexandria, who lived at the same time as Jesus, is of particular interest. He was a teacher and prolific writer, an able and high-minded man. He was a sympathetic student of Greek philosophy and saw clearly that the Hellenistic culture had in it much of good. Yet the ultimate source of all good was—must be —the Law of Jehovah of which his own people were the special custodians: of this his mind could entertain no

doubt. To reconcile these two facts, then, became the important task of Philo's life. Studying the Scriptures in the light of what his other studies had revealed to him he discovered hidden meanings almost everywhere, and in a surprising number of cases the hidden meaning was in accord with Greek philosophy. His conclusion was that Moses was the real father of philosophy; consciously or unconsciously the Greeks had taken their ideas from him. Other scholarly Jews, notably Josephus, labored at the same task of fusing Hellenism and Judaism, interpreting Hellenism for thoughtful Jews, and Judaism for educated men in the Hellenistic world. Doubtless they had a measure of success, but the fuller accomplishment of the fusion was to be the work of Christianity.

The Jews of the Dispersion seem to have been diligent in proselyting (cf. Matt. 23:15). But here again the different degrees of strictness or liberalism on the part of the Jews, and the different attitudes toward Judaism on the part of non-Jews, made themselves felt. Josephus (*Ant.* 20. 2. 4) tells of a royal convert, Izates of Adiabene, who took his new faith so seriously that he decided to be circumcized. But his Jewish teacher, Ananias, joined with the queen mother Helena, who was also a convert, in dissuading him from this. Ananias did not deem it necessary, and it was feared that the effect on his subjects would be bad. But later Ananias was succeeded by a stricter teacher, Eleazar, and under his influence the decision was reversed. Izates went the full length in becoming a Jew.

We gather that the status of half-proselyte, so to speak, was a common one in Gentile cities where there were Jewish communities. Many Gentiles were attracted to the lofty monotheism and the high moral standards of the Jews and attended the synagogue services with more or less regularity, but shrank from becoming Jews in the full sense. Such a step would be likely to subject them

to ridicule or even persecution, and there was also the fact that submission to circumcision involved discomfort and a degree of danger. It is noteworthy that Paul's disciple Timothy, though the son of a Jewish mother (Acts 16:1), and said to have been instructed in the Scriptures from infancy (2 Tim. 3:15) had reached manhood without having been circumcized. In Acts 13:16 Paul is represented as addressing his synagogue audience, in Pisidian Antioch, with the salutation, "Men of Israel, *and ye that fear God.*" These "God-Fearers"—not Jews by birth and evidently not proselytes in the full sense, yet devout attendants upon the services of the synagogue—appear frequently in Acts (see further 13:26; 16:14; 18:7; cf. 10:2, 22, 35; 17:4, 17; etc.).

The importance, for the launching of the Christian movement, of the Jewish Dispersion in general and the class of half-proselytes in particular, can scarcely be overestimated. Even a casual reading of Paul's letters and the Book of Acts makes it clear that the Jewish settlements in Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece, and Italy played a vital part in the diffusion of Christianity in the world outside of Palestine. The rank and file of the Jews of these settlements did not take kindly to the work of the Christian missionaries, and efforts to convert them seem not to have met with great success. But another, farther-reaching, result was achieved: the synagogues of the Dispersion proved open doors to the Gentile world. To many of the devout "God-fearers" the newly proclaimed gospel must have seemed to offer just that for which they felt the need: a Judaism denationalized, broadened, fulfilled; a Judaism, moreover, with a solution of the problem of man's weakness and need which familiarity with Gentile religions had already prepared them to understand and appreciate.

The fact that Christianity early made itself the heir of both Jewish and Hellenistic culture was destined to

profoundly influence its history, and it is not easy to see how this would have happened apart from the role which the Jewish Dispersion played. The Apostle Paul himself was a product of the Dispersion, and we can scarcely imagine his life taking the course which it did take had his whole pre-Christian life been spent in Palestine.

CHAPTER XV

THE HELLENISTIC BACKGROUND: RELIGIOUS

A. "Four Stages of Greek Religion."

In a book bearing the above title Professor Gilbert Murray has sketched the development of religion in the Greek world throughout the ancient period. It will be worth while to have the "four stages" before us, in briefest outline, here.

First there is the Age of Ignorance, or of "Primal Stupidity." A similar elementary stage is found among other peoples. Indeed, "one is tempted to regard it as the normal beginning of all religion, or almost as the normal raw material out of which religion is made." Gods, in the strict sense, have not yet come on the scene. "The truth is that this idea of a god . . . almost any being that we should naturally call a 'god'—is an idea not easy for primitive man to grasp. It is a subtle and rarified idea, saturated with ages of philosophy and speculation." In classical times each of the three great Athenian festivals—the Diasia, the Thesmophoria, and the Anthesteria—was associated in the popular mind with the worship of a particular deity. But upon close investigation of the ritual, in each case, the deity practically vanishes. Thus the Diasia was said to be the chief festival of Zeus, called Zeus Meilichios. But the sacrifice was not given to Zeus: it was consumed entire; and the epithet *Meilichios* ("He of appeasement") is significant. "He is merely the personified shadow or dream generated by the emotion of the ritual—very much, to take a familiar instance, as

Father Christmas is a 'projection' of our Christmas customs." And so with the gods associated with the other festivals.

Connected with each of these festivals, again, was a divine or sacred animal, and here we have something more primitive. The origin of the conception of sacred animals was discovered and explained nearly a quarter of a century ago by William Robertson Smith. The animal is sacred because it had a *mana*—some power or characteristic not to be accounted for in ordinary ways, as the fertility of the sow or the strength of the bull—and this belief leads to the custom of the sacramental meal, in which one eats the flesh and drinks the blood of the animal so as thus to get into one's self its *mana,* its vital power.

Another figure standing back of the gods, in point of time, is that of the priest, medicine man, or king—human beings possessed, in extraordinary degree, of *mana.* On occasion of great sacrifices the priest or king often covered his head with a beast-mask, thus, as it were, reënforcing his own *mana* with that of the animal. Professor Murray thinks that such a figure was, at first, the only god which his society knew.

A French writer, M. Doutté, has said that gods represent the collective desire of a people personified. Certainly collective desire, or collective dread, plays a very important role in religious development at its primitive stage, whatever may be said as to its influence in creating gods. And it is chiefly on two things—the food-supply and the tribe-supply—that this desire or dread concentrates. With the problem of securing these, and preventing their loss, primitive religion is largely concerned. Hence along with the effort to avail one's self of *mana* went the no less keen interest in the avoidance of *tabu,* the forbidden, the thing not to be done. For the breach of *tabu* somehow caused pestilence, war, loss of fertility.

Hence, also, came the prevalence of what we call licentious rites. It was assumed that human fertilization and the fertilization of the fields were essentially the same, and that by the practice of the one the other could be produced.

So much for the first stage. It ends, and the second stage is ushered in "when the clear outline that we call Classical Greece begins to take shape out of the mist." The great occasion of this momentous transition in world history seems to have been the coming of the Homeric poems from Ionia to Athens, to be recited at the Panathenaic Festival. The date was in the sixth century B. C. Herodotus tells us that Homer and Hesiod "made the generations of the gods for the Greeks and gave them their names and distinguished their offices and crafts and portrayed their shapes" (2:53). The primitive inhabitants of Greece had gods before that time, but they were vague and indefinite both as to number and to character. The Homeric poems introduced to Greece, and to the world, the Olympian family—the hierarchy of anthropomorphic deities which played an important role in religion for many centuries, and which even to our own day maintains its prestige in art and literature.

Whence came the Homeric gods? Of course they were not "made," literally, by the poems in which their exploits are set forth. They came, it would seem, from the north country, being the gods of the invading Achaioi who conquered the earlier inhabitants of the Greek peninsula and founded the race of the "Hellenes." And their earlier history had left its mark on their character.

> There is not much faith in these gods, as they appear to us in the Homeric Poems, and not much respect, except perhaps for Apollo and Athena and Poseidon. The buccaneer kings of the Heroic Age, cut loose from all local and tribal pieties, intent only

> on personal gain and glory, were not the people to build up a powerful religious faith. . . . Yet the power of romance is great. In the memory of Greece the kings and gods of the Heroic Age were transfigured. What had been really an age of reckless brutality became in memory an age of chivalry and splendid adventure. The traits that were at all tolerable were idealized; those that were intolerable were either expurgated, or, if that was impossible, were mysticized and explained away. And the savage old Olympians became to Athens and the mainland of Greece from the sixth century onward emblems of high humanity and religious reform.

The Olympian religion was a superb endeavor, and that is saying much; but it was an endeavor that did not succeed. Its effort at moral reform did not succeed. It failed "owing to the mere force of inertia possessed by old religious traditions and local cults. We must remember how weak any central government was in ancient civilization. The power and influence of a highly civilized society were apt to end a few miles outside its city walls. All through the backward parts of Greece obscene and cruel rites lingered on, the darker and worse the further they were removed from the full light of Hellenism.

> But in this respect the Olympian Religion did not merely fail: it did worse. To make the elements of a nature-religion human is inevitably to make them vicious. There is no great moral harm in worshiping a thunderstorm, even though the lightning strikes the good and evil quite recklessly. There is no need to pretend that the lightning is exercising a wise and righteous choice. But when once you worship an imaginary quasi-human being who throws the lightning, you are in a dilemma. Either you have to admit that you are worshipping and flattering a

> being with no moral sense, because he happens to be dangerous, or else you have to invent reasons for his wrath against the people who happen to be struck. And they are pretty sure to be bad reasons. The god, if personal, becomes capricious and cruel. . . . Again, to worship elements of fertility and generation, as was done in agricultural rites all through the Aegean area, is in itself an intelligible and not necessarily a degrading practice. But when those elements are somehow humanized, and the result is an anthropomorphic god of enormous procreative power and innumerable amours, a religion so modified has received a death blow.

And the attempt "to bring intellectual order into the welter of primitive gods" was not more successful than the attempt at moral reformation had been. Very often a local deity was identified with Zeus, Hera, or another of the Olympian family—a move which might seem to tend in the direction of order and simplicity in the pantheon. But actually such a result was not produced. In becoming identified with a great number of local gods Zeus, for example, became at the same time the husband of a great number of local goddesses—a situation which was not conducive to intellectual order any more than to moral purity.

> The only satisfactory end of that effort would have been monotheism. If Zeus had only gone further and become completely, once and for all, the father of all life, the scandalous stories would have lost their point and meaning. It is curious how near to monotheism, and to monotheism of a very profound and impersonal type, the real religion of Greece came in the sixth and fifth centuries. Many of the philosophers, Xenophanes, Parmenides, and others, asserted it clearly or assumed it without hes-

> itation. Aeschylus, Euripides and Plato in their deeper moments point the same road. Indeed a metaphysician might hold that their theology is far deeper than that to which we are accustomed. . . . Certainly Greek monotheism, had it really carried the day, would have been a far more philosophic thing than the tribal and personal monotheism of the Hebrews. But unfortunately too many hard-caked superstitions, too many tender and sensitive associations, were linked with particular figures in the pantheon or particular rites which had brought the worshippers religious peace. If there had been some Hebrew prophets about, and a tyrant or two, progressive and bloody-minded, to agree with them, polytheism might perhaps actually have been stamped out in Greece at one time. But Greek thought, always sincere and daring, was seldom brutal, seldom ruthless or cruel. The thinkers of the great period felt their way gently to the Holy of Holies, and did not try to compel others to take the same way.

Was it a virtue or a defect—this tolerance, this tentativeness, of Greek religion? In any case it was deeply characteristic, and is of deep significance in understanding the Greek contribution to the religious heritage which has come down to the modern world. The Olympian gods

> are artists' dreams, ideals, allegories; they are symbols of something beyond themselves. They are Gods of half-rejected tradition, of unconscious make-believe, of aspiration. They are gods to whom doubtful philosophers can pray, with all a philosopher's due caution, as to so many radiant and heart-searching hypotheses. They are not gods in whom any one believes as a hard fact. Does this condemn them? Or is it just the other way? Is it perhaps that the differ-

> ence between Religion and Superstition lies exactly in this, that Superstition degrades its worship by turning its beliefs into so many statements of brute fact, on which it must needs act without question, without striving, without any respect for others or any desire for higher or fuller truth? It is only an accident—though perhaps an invariable accident—that all the supposed facts are false. In Religion, however precious you may consider the truth you draw from it, you know that it is a truth seen dimly, and possibly seen by others better than by you. You know that all your creeds and definitions are merely metaphors, attempts to use human language for a purpose for which it was never made. Your concepts are, by the nature of things, inadequate; the truth is not in you but beyond you, a thing not conquered but still to be pursued. Something like this, I take it, was the character of the Olympian Religion in the higher minds of later Greece.

But even in the case of the higher minds a lot of adjustment—a vast deal of allegorizing—was required; and the higher minds, after all, were comparatively few. The fact is, as Professor Murray fully realizes, that "by the time of Plato the traditional religion of the Greeks was, if taken at its face value, a bankrupt concern."

And this brings us to the third stage, to which Professor Murray attaches the suggestive label, "The Failure of Nerve." It extends roughly from Aristotle to Paul—the Hellenistic Age, with the New Testament writings standing near its close.

> Anyone who turns from the great writers of classical Athens, say Sophocles or Aristotle, to those of the Christian era must be conscious of a great difference in tone. There is a change in the whole

relation of the writer to the world about him. The new quality is not specifically Christian: it is just as marked in the Gnostics and Mithras-worshipers as in the Gospels and the Apocalypse, in Julian and Plotinus as in Gregory and Jerome. It is hard to describe. It is a rise of asceticism, of mysticism, in a sense, of pessimism; a loss of self-confidence, of hope in this life and of faith in normal human effort; a despair of patient inquiry, a cry for infallible revelation; an indifference to the welfare of the state, a conversion of the soul to God. It is an atmosphere in which the aim of the good man is not so much to live justly, to help the society to which he belongs and enjoy the esteem of his fellow creatures; but rather, by means of a burning faith, by contempt for the world and its standards, by ecstasy, suffering and martyrdom to be granted pardon for his unspeakable unworthiness, his immeasurable sins. There is an intensifying of certain spiritual emotions; an increase of sensitiveness, a failure of nerve.

Now this antithesis is often exaggerated. . . . A hundred people write as if Sophocles had no mysticism and practically speaking no conscience. Half a dozen retort as if St. Paul had no public spirit and no common sense. I have protested often against this exaggeration; but, stated reasonably, as a change of proportion and not a creation of new hearts, the antithesis is certainly based on fact. . . .

I do not depreciate the religions that followed on this movement by describing the movement itself as a "failure of nerve." Mankind has not yet decided which of two opposite methods leads to the fuller and deeper knowledge of the world: the patient and sympathetic study of the good citizen who lives in it, or the ecstatic vision of the saint who rejects it. But probably most Christians are inclined to believe

> that without some failure and sense of failure, without a contrite heart and conviction of sin, man can hardly attain the religious life.

And from this point of view it is natural that the intellectual and spiritual outlook of the Hellenistic world should be regarded as having been providentially prepared for the advent of Christianity. It has been so regarded, quite generally, by Christian historians.

We would expect that in philosophy, if anywhere, the oldtime "nerve" would maintain itself. Actually it did so in a measure only. Stoic and Epicurean thought—indeed ancient thought in general—was prone to appeal to some subjective sense of fitness rather than to objective observation and experiment. Thus the argument from "the common consent of humanity" was likely to have more validity in their thought than it had in sober fact. It led both Zeno and Epicurus—uncompromising thinkers though they were—to

> open curious side-doors at the last moment and let in all the gods of mythology. True, they are admitted as suspicious characters, and under promise of good behavior. Epicurus explains that they do not and cannot do anything whatever to anybody; Zeno explains that they are not anthropomorphic, and are only symbols or emanations or subordinates of the all-ruling Unity; both parties get rid of the myths. But the two great reformers have admitted a dangerous principle. The general consensus of humanity, they say, shows that there are gods, and gods which in mind, if not in visual appearance, resemble man. Epicurus succeeded in barring the door, and admitted nothing more. But the Stoics presently found themselves admitting or insisting that the same consensus proved the existence of daemons, of witchcraft, of divination, and when they combined

with the Platonic school, of more dangerous elements still.

Not only did the old gods survive, or revive, but new ones also came on the scene. It was the partial discrediting of the old, seemingly, which served to create the new. If it was not the old gods of the Olympian family who made things happen, then what did make them happen? There were two possible answers. You might say it was pure chance. Or, if you were of a more reflective turn of mind, you would say that a chain of inescapable causes produced each separate event. In the one case you have Chance, or Fortune; in the other Fate, or Destiny. And it was but a short step to making Fortune and Destiny deities, as personal and anthropomorphic as Apollo and Athena had ever been. During the revolutionary changes in political boundaries and social adjustments which the Mediterranean world experienced from the time of Alexander to that of Augustus the worship of Fate and Fortune advanced by leaps and bounds. The phenomenon is not hard to understand. In such a society man's own efforts and merits seem to count for little or nothing. If he would escape destruction, and secure a measure of happiness, he would best try to placate that Fortune which so obviously has favored the mighty ones.

And closely connected with the worship of Destiny another group of deities—the heavenly bodies—began to assume an important role. Their theoretical divinity was not a new idea among the Greeks, but it was not until relatively late, and through Persian and Babylonian influences, that their worship became widely popular. "Astrology fell upon the Hellenistic mind as a new disease falls upon some remote island people. Every one was ready to receive the germ." Here again the Stoics fell a particularly easy prey. We have seen that

they made much of the *"sympathy of the universe,"* believing that "whatever happens to any one part, however remote or insignificant, affects all the rest. It seemed only a natural and beautiful illustration of this Sympathy that the movements of the Stars should be bound up with the sufferings of man."

The Seven planets, however, were for the most part regarded as malevolent deities. Evidence for this is found in the liturgies of the Mithra cult, various Gnostic bodies, and other religious systems of later antiquity. Beyond the seven planets there is an Eighth region, the home of the ultimate God. Toward it—which is to say toward true Being, toward true Freedom, toward Union with God—men strive; but the Planets stand in the way. "The Gnostic writings consist largely of charms to be uttered by the soul to each of the Planets in turn, as it pursues its perilous path past all of them to its ultimate home.

> That journey awaits us after death; but in the meantime? In the meantime there are initiations, sacraments, mystic ways of communion with God. To see God face to face is, to the ordinary unprepared man, sheer death. But to see Him after due purification, to be led to Him along the true Way by an initiating Priest is the ultimate blessing of human life. It is to die and be born again.

These mystic ceremonies, widely practiced by the devotees of many cults, were a characteristic feature of Hellenistic religion in the period of the New Testament. They show perhaps more clearly than anything else, how far the "decline of nerve" had gone—to what extent men had lost self-confidence, had been driven back to non-intellectual ways of solving the problem of life.

The last two paragraphs have already served as a slight introduction to the so-called Mystery Cults. But

it seems better that separate sections should be devoted to them and to emperor-worship—another important phenomenon of the Hellenistic period.

The fourth stage, in Professor Murray's outline, requires but brief comment here. It centers in "The Last Protest" of Greek religion in the fourth century, against the advancing tide of "atheism" sponsored by Christianity. Julian the one non-Christian emperor after Constantine, tried to restore the old religion, but his short reign (360-363 A. D.) allowed him altogether insufficient time for so great a task. In one literary memorial of his reign, which happily has come down to us, we have what may be called the creed of enlightened Greek paganism in this period of its final exit from history. It is the treatise "On the Gods and the World," by Sallustius, the friend and adviser of the emperor Julian.

The most vulnerable point of paganism was the traditional mythology. Sallustius deals with it at once. The myths, he says, "state the existence of Gods to all, but who and what they are only to those who can understand." He argues that

> to wish to teach the whole truth about the Gods to all produces contempt in the foolish, because they cannot understand, and lack of zeal in the good; whereas to conceal the truth by myths prevents the contempt of the foolish, and compels the good to practice philosophy. But why have they put in the myths stories of adultery, robbery, father-binding, and all the other absurdity? Is not that perhaps a thing worthy of admiration, done so that by means of the visible absurdity the Soul may immediately feel that the words are veils and believe the truth to be a mystery?

Sallustius proceeds to explain in detail some myths

that were particularly subject to Christian attack: Kronos swallowing his children, the golden apple and the judgment of Paris, Attis and the Mother of the Gods. By allegorical interpretation their crudities are explained away and profound and edifying truths are seen in them.

The reasoning of Sallustius at many points is not convincing to the modern mind, but few will withhold admiration for the lofty spirit which reveals itself in what he writes. He is a polytheist and an apologist for polytheism, yet he can speak of "God" quite as naturally as of "the Gods." "It is proper to the First Cause to be One," he says, "—for unity precedes multitude—and to surpass all things in power and goodness. Consequently all things must partake of it. For owing to its power nothing else can hinder it, and owing to its goodness it will not hold itself apart." Elsewhere in the treatise he says of the gods: "Neither are they contained by space; for that is a property of bodies. Neither are they separate from the First Cause nor from one another, just as thoughts are not separate from mind nor acts of knowledge from the soul." At times one suspects that Sallustius is more truly a monotheist than many a modern from whom a theoretical polytheism is far removed, but whose world is obviously ruled not by an all-pervading goodness but by a plurality of powers. At any rate he fitly typifies the Greek spirit in religion, and that is our justification for dealing with him here. He typifies that spirit in his thoughtfulness, his calm, his tolerance. His treatise obviously has in view what he deemed the false doctrines of Christianity, yet it is entirely free from invective and from that misrepresentation of opponents' beliefs and practices which religious controversy has so persistently called forth. He writes with warmth of feeling, but he writes also with calmness and dignity.

B. Emperor-worship.

We have seen that despite Rome's military and political supremacy the dominant cultural influence in the eastern Mediterranean world in New Testament times was not Roman but Greek. This holds true of religion as well as of other cultural interests, with the difference that in religion, more than in other fields, Oriental influences made themselves felt along with the Greek. Of this more later. For the moment we are concerned with the one important contribution from the Roman side (though even it was by no means entirely Roman)—the worship of the emperor.

So extensively did Rome take over the religious beliefs and practices of Greeks and Orientals that by the beginning of the Christian era what was distinctively Roman had largely fallen into decay. One important feature, however—the *genius* doctrine—retained its prestige, and under Augustus and his successors was made to play an important role. The genius idea was a form of primitive spiritism: the idea of a guardian spirit attached to every person, indeed to almost every thing.

> Every individual, every house and every family, every country, every city and province, legions, cohorts, centuries, corporations, guilds and unions—all had their genius. But the feeling of piety, which saw "in everything the trace of a god" . . . peopled every space with divine beings—wells, mountains, deserts, markets, palaces, warehouses, baths, archives and theaters. Everyone who frequented these places paid homage to the genius or the "guardian power (tutela) whether god or goddess." The merchant, whose business took him to remote frontier lands, sacrificed there "to the genius of the Roman people and trade"; the traveler in unknown and

> inhospitable countries "to the god who invented roads and paths." . . . The cult of the domestic gods . . ., in spite of the prohibition against it, lasted far on into Christian times, during which angels soon took the place of genii. (Friedlander, *Roman Life and Manners Under the Early Empire,* III, 114-15.)

The genius of the Roman People had been worshiped since far back in the days of the republic (at least as early as 218 B. C.). After the establishment of the empire it was inevitable that the genius of the reigning emperor should take its place beside that of the Roman people as an object of worship. Doubtless Augustus, in giving sanction to the worship of his genius, had no thought of any deification of himself. The two ideas were not necessarily identical, yet it was easy to make them so. "It was unavoidable that the idea of the imperial genius, worshiped as the tutelary deity of the people, should be confounded in the popular belief with the person of the emperor, who thus himself came to be regarded as the tutelary and controlling god" (Friedlander, *ibid.,* III, 115).

In Greece, and in the East in general, the soil was well prepared for the reception of the new cult. It is true that during the classical period in Greece the tendency to make gods of men had been held in check. But in this as in other matters the Hellenistic age reverted to more primitive beliefs and practices. In early times the medicine-man, priest, or king had been worshiped because of the unexplained power which he possessed. With increase of culture this deification of men had become unusual, but the custom had been submerged rather than blotted out. It remained customary to venerate great men after their death as heroes or demigods. Aristotle himself built an altar to Plato,

though this did not mean that he worshiped him in any superstitious sense. But the distinction between reverence and worship in such cases is more readily preserved by the philosopher than by the average man. The regard in which the saints were held by Christians in the Middle Ages will serve as a rough parallel.

The career of Alexander had particular importance in preparing the way for the emperor-worship cult. In Egypt, Babylonia, and other Oriental countries which he conquered, the idea of the ruler being divine had maintained itself more strongly than in Greece or any other country of the West. Small wonder, then, that Alexander, the conqueror of divine kings, should himself have been hailed as divine. Divine honors were paid to him before his death, and this may be said to mark the entrance into the Graeco-Roman world of the practice of worshiping a ruler while he was yet alive. Under Alexander's successors the worship was developed and made official, and when the Romans, in their turn, came to the East to play the role of conqueror, it was a matter of course that their leaders should be ranked as gods. Divine honors were rendered to Flaminius after he had defeated Philip V. of Macedon (196 B. C.). A similar distinction was enjoyed by other Roman generals in the following years. In 195 B. C. a temple was erected at Smyrna in honor of the goddess Roma, a new deity designed to personify the new power that was now playing so large a part in the affairs of the East. Pompey's brilliant career in the eastern provinces naturally led to his being regarded as a god, and when Julius Caesar pursued and defeated him consistency demanded that at least as high honors be paid to him.

In Rome itself the cult may be said to date from Caesar's return to the capital after his victories in the East (46 B. C.). But here public sentiment was much less favorable to its growth. Augustus was careful not

to offend the democratic susceptibilities of the Romans by making too exalted claims for himself at home, even at a time when his worship had become widespread among the people of the East. But he did introduce the worship of his own *genius,* and built in the forum a temple to Julius Caesar, whom the senate had declared a god. During the reigns of several of the successors of Augustus the situation continued much the same. But in time the democratic tradition was undermined and the Oriental idea prevailed. Under Domitian (81-96 A. D.) and his successors the worship of the emperor became an established Roman cult.

To us the widespread popularity which this worship attained seems strange. Yet when we view the situation as a whole we see that it was not unnatural. In the background was the primitive disposition to regard as in some way more than human one who wields more than ordinary human power. It had already manifested itself, for centuries, in the Greek veneration of heroes and in the belief of Oriental peoples that their kings had divine connections of some sort. There was also the Roman genius doctrine as an additional favoring circumstance. Granted such a background, plus the political situation of the first century A. D., it was almost inevitable that the cult of emperor-worship should not only rise but should attain great prominence. From the point of view of the average man the power and influence wielded by the Roman emperor were so great as to be utterly unexplainable on human grounds. His position was so far above anything of which ordinary experience gave knowledge that it was entirely natural for him to be regarded as a being of a different sphere. Most of the subjects of the empire were already accustomed to associating the idea of divinity with mighty personages, and it would have been strange if they had not done so with the emperors.

C. The Mystery Cults.

This important contribution to the religious thought and life of the Hellenistic world came from the Graeco-Oriental, not the Roman, side. The term "mystery" as here used points to rites of initiation and other observances practiced by these cults. The most sacred rites were kept entirely secret from the uninitiated, and in the case of ceremonies which might be witnessed by outsiders the significance of what took place perhaps would be fully understood only by members of the cult. The same cults are sometimes referred to as "religions of redemption," which indicates another characteristic of all of them. Their interest centered in the individual rather than in the tribe or state, and they offered to the individual devotee not only satisfactions in the present life but also, and more particularly, the assurance of a blessed immortality. And their universalism, if we may so call it, was yet another characteristic of the mystery cults. Each, it would seem, was originally attached to some particular nation or locality; but they were never ethnic religions, as the early Hebrew and Roman religions for example were, and their interest being in the individual it was easy for them to transcend national boundary lines. Several of them made the empire itself, or large areas of it, their home. The important common features, then, may be summed up thus: secret rites, interest centered in the individual, the promise of immortality, and international and inter-racial appeal.

The Eleusinian mysteries were far-famed in the Mediterranean world. They were celebrated at Eleusis, a few miles from Athens. Initiation into the cult was so highly prized that it was sought by persons of high rank, not only Greeks but men of other lands. Even emperors visited Eleusis to be initiated and take part in the mysteries. The "Greater Mysteries" were held in September and lasted seven days—nine days in later times. There

were processions, purifications, fastings, and sacrifices, the whole reaching a climax in some sort of religious drama or passion play. The exact nature of this is unknown, the vow of secrecy having apparently been well kept. But the particular deities to which the cult owed allegiance were the goddess Demeter and her daughter Persephone, and it is probable that their experiences—well known to those acquainted with Greek mythology—formed the theme of the passion play. Persephone had been carried off to the lower world and Demeter was in anguish until her daughter was restored to her. It is likely that through the drama the initiate was in some way given assurance that he too would overcome the power which ruled the realm of death. Whatever the means used it is certain that the aim of the ceremonies as a whole, and the closing drama in particular, was to convey deep emotional satisfaction together with assurance of the soul's safety in the world beyond. And it is equally certain that in the case of multitudes of worshipers the aim was realized.

The Eleusinian cult was in a sense—though only in a sense—an exception to the rule that the mystery religions were free from attachment to a particular locality. At an early date this cult had been officially adopted by the Athenian state, and it did not migrate to other lands. We have seen, however, that the people of other lands came to it and that initiation was open to them. But in the case of other cults, scarcely less famous, the rites might be celebrated wherever a group of believers organized themselves. Thus the cult of Dionysus, originally from Thrace, spread into Greece and elsewhere, so that its orgiastic rites became widely known. The Cybele-Attis cult, of Phrygian origin, was established in Rome as early as 204 B. C. From Egypt went forth the mysteries connected with the names of Isis and Osiris. They were known to the Greeks in the time of Herodotus

(fifth century B. C.) and in the Hellenistic period the vogue of the cult in the Mediterranean world became widespread. Syria contributed the cult of Aphrodite and Adonis, while from Persia came a mystery religion—that of Mithra—which in the second and third centuries became the foremost rival of Christianity in the struggle for religious supremacy in the Roman Empire.

To a considerable degree the mystery religions, like emperor-worship, represent a turning back to the primitive. For example, the Demeter and Persephone myth, and the rites associated with it, bear plainly the marks of a primitive nature cult, in spite of the fact that they came to be associated with the highest civilization which the ancient world could boast. It will be remembered that in the myth an arrangement was made by which Persephone, carried off by Pluto to the lower world, might return and be with her mother during half of each year. During this time naturally mother and daughter were happy and radiant, while the period of the daughter's sojourn with Pluto was one of undiminished gloom. This was primitive man's way of expressing what happened when the seasons changed. The period of joy was summer, the gloomy time winter, and the aim of the rites was to make sure that the summer season of fertility and happiness would indeed return each year.

How such cults could in time become "religions of redemption" is not difficult to understand. With the advance of culture the primitive concern about the seasons and fertility was less keen; the problem of the food-supply and the tribe-supply was still present, but it was not felt as much as formerly to be a problem which man himself was powerless to solve. On the other hand, concern about immortality had become more keen, and here was a problem which truly was beyond man's power to solve. Gradually the mystery cults adapted themselves

to the changed outlook, the primitive rites being still observed but with meanings attached to them which were much less primitive. It seems probable that some such evolution had been undergone by these cults in general, as they existed in the New Testament period. At any rate the point which had been reached, at this time, was pretty much the same in all. As Demeter had lost her daughter, so Aphrodite had lost her lover, and Cybele and Isis their consorts, in the Syrian, Phrygian, and Egyptian mysteries respectively; and in each case the triumphant recovery of the lost one brought conviction to the devotee that the god or goddes could in like manner conqueror death for him, and would do so if, through initiation, his life was mystically united with that of the deity.

Related to the mystery religions was the type of interest and activity to which the name Gnosticism is applied. It assumed many forms, but in general it may be described as a combination of mystical religion, magic, and speculative philosophy. The philosophy was markedly dualistic. The world of matter and the world of spirit were seen as entirely distinct and antagonistic each to each. Man's soul belonged to the world of spirit, but it had the misfortune to be tied up with a material body and so to be greatly hampered in its activities. Only by divine aid could it be released, and this aid was made available through initiation into certain mysteries. But the Gnostic mysteries tended to be more abstract—less pictorial—than those of the typical mystery cults. What was revealed to the initiated was a "gnosis"—an esoteric doctrine, a hidden wisdom into which other mortals could not penetrate. The problem of salvation was to be solved through the proper use of magic formulæ. The deities, again, were often conceived in abstract terms: as Light, Truth, Wisdom, and the like. Yet all this is not

to be taken as indicating that Gnosticism was emotionally cold. There is abundant evidence that it could be quite otherwise. Ecstatic experiences were much emphasized. "I in thee, and thou in me!" is the cry of one of the liturgies (see Murray, *op. cit.*, 131).

As compared with the current philosophy the mystery religions may be said to mark an appeal from the intellectual to the emotional or mystical, as compared with emperor-worship an appeal from Power manifested in the flesh to Powers not so manifested yet felt to be greater and more available in man's greatest need. In general they represent, more truly than any other phenomenon, the dominant mood of the Hellenistic age. Though for purposes of comparison we set them over against philosophy, the local religions, and the emperor-worship cult it is to be remembered that actually these were not rivals. Some of the greatest of the philosophers have left on record their sense of the value of the mysteries. The Eleusinian rites, says Epictetus, were "appointed by the ancients for the instruction and correction of life" (*Disc.* 3. 21). They are to be regarded with reverence. Cicero, in evaluating the contribution which Athens had made to Roman civilization as "excellent and divine," says that no element in this contribution was of greater value than the mysteries (*De Leg.* 2:14). It is evident that the "failure of nerve"—the realization of man's inability to solve his problems alone —was felt by intellectuals as well as by the ignorant. The Hellenistic world was deeply religious, and the mystery cults were serving—evidently with no small degree of effectiveness—to provide expression for its religiousness. Such was the situation when Christianity appeared on the scene.

D. Morality.

It is hard to form in one's mind a clear and fair picture

of moral conditions in the Hellenistic world. We must be warned against erroneous assumptions. On the one hand we must beware of assuming that deep religiousness would necessarily carry with it a high morality. Where religion retained primitive elements the opposite tendency was largely at work. On the other hand we are not to assume that a balanced view of the situation is to be had from prejudiced witnesses, such as Juvenal and Petronius, the satirists, or Tertullian, the Christian apologist; or that morality in the provinces was necessarily as low as in the capital; or that vicious *practices* in the pagan world can fairly be set over against the high *ideals* of Christianity.

At many points the ablest students of the subject are left in uncertainty.

> Are there not subjects on which Plato himself sometimes makes our flesh creep? What are we to feel about slavery, about the exposing of children? True, slavery was not peculiar to antiquity; it flourished in a civilized and peculiarly humane people of English blood till a generation ago. And the history of infanticide among the finest modern nations is such as to make one reluctant to throw stones, and even doubtful in which direction to throw them. Still, these great facts and others like them have to be understood, and are rather hard to understand. . . . Points of minor morals again are apt to surprise a reader of ancient literature. . . . Was it really an ordinary thing in the first century, as Philo seems to say, for gentlemen at dinner parties to black one another's eyes or bite one another's ears off? (*De Vit. Contempl.* 477 M.) Or were such practices confined to some Smart Set? Or was Philo, for his own purposes, using some particular scandalous occurrence as if it was typical? St. Augustine (*Conf.* 919)

> mentions among the virtues of his mother her unusual meekness and tact. Although her husband had a fiery temper, she never had bruises on her face, which made her a *rara avis* among the matrons of her circle (Murray, *op. cit.*, 161-162).

But we reflect that the circle in which Augustine's mother moved presumably included Christians. At any rate we have evidence that at this time, the middle of the fourth century, "the conduct of the Christians, either to the rest of the world or to one another, was very far from evangelical. Ammianus says that no savage beasts could equal its cruelty; Ammianus was a pagan; but St. Gregory himself says it was like Hell" (*ibid.*, 162).

Professor Murray's answer to the puzzle, in so far as he has one, may be summed up in a sentence or two.

> Not only in early Greek times, but throughout the whole of antiquity the possibility of all sorts of absurd and atrocious things lay much nearer, the protective forces of society were much weaker, the strain on personal character, the need for real "wisdom and virtue," was much greater than it is at the present day . . . in general, the strong governments and orderly societies of modern Europe have made it infinitely easier for men of no particular virtue to live a decent life . . . (*Idem.*)

No doubt this is true. But there is ground for hope, surely, that "protective forces" have been built up by individuals as well as by society;—that men and women to-day—in much greater numbers than twenty centuries ago—possess a moral fiber which makes their conduct largely independent of the safeguards provided by strong governments and orderly society.

And it seems clear that the credit for the accumulation of these protective forces, both individual and social,

belongs largely to religion—above all to Judaism and Christianity. Apparently what is most needed to give men real moral stamina is conviction that the laws of conduct to which they adhere are not prescribed from without but are of the very essence of things. In the Hellenistic age philosophy went far toward giving this conviction, as in our time science goes far toward giving it. But neither, without the aid of religion, has been able to go far enough. To most men the evidence which yields greatest satisfaction and greatest strength is that which comes not through intellectual processes but through emotional, spiritual experience. Stoicism had a high standard of morality, but it was unable to "put it across" to a degree that was at all adequate. The mystery cults did something toward providing the needed religious dynamic, but they were fatally handicaped by the immoral associations which their myths and rites had brought with them from primitive times. Judaism, with its far more ethical traditions, had already made its influence felt in the world outside of Palestine. But it too was handicaped, in other ways, as we have seen. Hence the great opportunity of Christianity: to make the life and teachings of its Founder the basis of an ethic such as the world had not yet seen, a Stoicism purged and enriched, a Judaism broadened and vitalized, a philosophy of life with roots spiritual as well as intellectual, not to be affected by surface changes, advancing with the advance of experience.

That Christianity did this at once, or has done it in full measure yet, is too much to say. Ends so great are attained only over long periods.

E. Influence of Hellenistic Religions on the Religion of the New Testament.

It used to be customary for students of these religions and of other elements in the culture of the time to ask

merely what they had contributed toward preparing the way for Christianity. But more recently the question has gone farther. We now ask to what extent, if at all, ideas and practices from this environment found their way *into* Christianity. We shall discuss the point but very briefly here. One side of it has already been treated in the last chapter, in the discussion of the influence of philosophy on Christianity.

In the first place, the Hebrew-Christian line has not been the only line through which God has revealed Himself. No one can study the religions of other peoples with even moderate understanding and sympathy without realizing increasingly that here too is much of truth —much of real knowledge of, and fellowship with, God. And with the Hellenistic religions this is markedly the case. In the second place, however, the influence of Judaism on Christianity was, as a matter of fact, stronger than the influence of Hellenism—at least if we go no farther than the Christianity of the New Testament. This is what the circumstances of Christianity's rise should lead us to expect, and the expectation is verified by a study of the contents of the New Testament. Third, the Hellenistic influence is seen particularly in the writings of Paul and in those which bear the name of "John." Details are much in dispute (*e.g.* the dependence, or otherwise, of these writers on the Mystery cults for their teachings regarding sacraments, salvation through Christ's death, union with Christ, for certain of their religious terms, etc.), but it can scarcely be doubted that these writings really show the influence of Hellenistic religious thought. Their authors were engaged in the task of showing how the religious satisfactions for which men longed, and the moral safeguards which men required, were to be found, in supreme measure, in Christianity. But the same claim—though in less exclusive fashion—was constantly being made for one and another

of the current religions and philosophies. It would have been strange if something of both the method and the matter of this familiar apologetic had not been adopted by the preachers of Christianity.

But, in the fourth and last place, when we use the term "dependence" in such connections as this it is well that we should use it with care and thoughtfulness. One thing which the student of religious history learns is that the experience of different peoples in their quest for God is likely to be more or less parallel. Hence "dependence" of one religion upon another—borrowing of ideas or practices—is not to be assumed too hastily. Moreover the kind of importance attaching to the question of whether such dependence exists—*e.g.* of Christianity upon the Mystery cults—should be rightly understood. The matter has technical importance and interest for the student investigating Christian origins. Of practical importance as affecting the truth or value of Christianity it has little or none. God's spirit breatheth where He listeth, and the value of this or that which has found its way into the New Testament is not to be discounted merely because of the suspicion that it has a "pagan" source. Many of us would wish that at least one characteristic of Hellenistic religion—its spirit of tolerance—had been taken over more fully by Christianity.

PART IV

THE MATTER OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER XVI

NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE: CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES

A. Influence of Other Literature.

Much the most extensive influence to be noted is that of the Old Testament. Some editions of the New Testament (*e.g.* Westcott & Hort in Greek and Moffatt in English) distinguish Old Testament matter quoted in the New by the use of different type. The total number of New Testament passages thus distinguished by Westcott & Hort is 889. A good many of these are composite, one passage containing matter from two or more Old Testament passages. The total number of Old Testament passages used in the New is probably well over a thousand, even when passages used repeatedly are counted only once. It may be worth while to add that Revelation easily leads the New Testament books in the extent of saturation with the phraseology of the Old Testament. It contains 240 of Westcott & Hort's 889 passages. Matthew comes next with 93. Acts has 90, Hebrews 85, Luke 80, and Romans 71. Mark has 49 and John only 20 (see Westcott & Hort, I, 581-595).

The above figures include passages where the use is in the nature of an allusion or a reminiscence, as well as those in which Old Testament matter is quoted directly and explicitly. It has been computed that about 160 Old Testament passages have been directly quoted by New Testament writers, nearly half of these being from the Psalms and Isaiah (see Swete, *Int. to Old Testament in Greek,* 386).

The Old Testament which the New Testament writers used was in the main the Greek translation known as the Septuagint, to which we have already referred. This translation had been made in the third and second centuries B. C., a circumstance which the early Christians very naturally came to think of as providential. Comparatively few of them knew Hebrew, and but for the Septuagint the use of the Old Testament by Christians of the earliest generations would have been much less extensive than it was.

The Septuagint differs considerably at many points from the Hebrew text on which our English versions of the Old Testament are based; hence when we turn from a passage quoted in the New Testament to the same passage in the Old Testament as we have it, more or less variation is likely to be found. The differences are in part due to loose or free rendering on the part of the Septuagint translators, and in part to the fact that the Hebrew text from which they translated differed from that which became standard later and has held the field down to the present time.

Why did the early Christian writers—Clement of Rome, "Barnabas," Polycarp, and others of the early fathers, as well as those whose writings are in the New Testament—make such large use of the Old Testament? The Book of Revelation is a somewhat special case and will be dealt with later. In the case of writers like Clement and Polycarp one may suspect that lack of ability to produce original work had something to do with it. "Barnabas" gives the impression of having written largely to exhibit his exegetical cleverness, which would sufficiently explain his using the Old Testament so extensively. One may have a little the same feeling about the Epistle to the Hebrews, though it is of a much higher order than the work of the so-called Barnabas. But in the case of writers like Paul and "Matthew" cer-

tainly neither of these reasons applies. Each of these men had plenty to say on his own account, and neither was concerned with exegesis for exegesis sake, yet both used the Old Testament a great deal. The reason was largely because they, in common with early Christians in general, found in almost every part of the Old Testament prophecies of the Christ and proofs of what they believed and affirmed about Jesus as the Christ and the church which He had founded on earth. It was this more than anything else, which caused the Old Testament to be so much used as a literary source by the early propagators of Christianity.

And we must add that their conception of what constituted prediction and proof was quite different from that of our scientific age. In numerous cases arguments based on Old Testament passages are quite unconvincing to readers of the present day. Sometimes "the so-called proofs are simply illustrations, and not always very happy illustrations, of the doctrine in question," as Professor Moffatt remarks (*Int.,* 22). Indeed this whole line of evidence, as used by the early church, is comparatively valueless to-day. Our conception of the greatness of Christ and of Christianity is probably as high as was theirs, but our idea of wherein supreme greatness consists and of what it is that shows such greatness is somewhat different. That something had been predicted long before, and occurred as predicted, was impressive evidence to the ancient and medieval mind. It is not impressive at all to the modern mind.

But this is not to say that the point of view of early Christian writers with regard to the Old Testament is one with which we can have no sympathy. These writers saw a great ideal realized in Jesus of Nazareth and in the religion which traced its descent from him, and that same ideal they saw *forecasted* in the writers of the Old Testament. Surely they were right—profoundly right—

in this. The difference is simply that they conceived the relation between primitive Christian history and the dreams of Hebrew prophets—the aspirations of Hebrew saints—in a more mechanical fashion than is possible for us.

It is interesting to note that at some points the New Testament shows the influence of the Tradition—*i.e.* the interpretations and elaborations of the scribes—as well as of the Old Testament itself. In the seventh chapter of Acts, for example, the details of Hebrew history recited by Stephen are in part taken from the scribal Haggadah (cf. Chap. XII). Thus in the sixteenth verse all the patriarchs, not Joseph only, as in Genesis, are buried in the tomb bought by Abraham, while Shechem and Machpelah (near Hebron) are confused in naming the location of the tomb. In verses 20-25, on the birth and earlier life of Moses, various details are from the rabbinic tradition rather than the Exodus narrative—*e.g.* Moses being "exceeding fair," "instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," "mighty in words" (which rather disagrees with Ex. 4:10), "forty years old" when he began his work for his people, etc. In verses 38 and 53, as in Gal. 3:19 and Heb. 2:2, we meet with the tradition which connected angels with the giving of the Law.

Of Jewish writings outside the Old Testament three—1 Enoch, Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), and the Wisdom of Solomon—seem to have exerted more influence on the New Testament than any others. But even in the case of these three there is little that can be called direct quotation: what is observed is rather reflections, here and there, of their ideas and phraseology. Traces of the use of Josephus are to be found apparently in 2 Pet., Luke, and Acts, and perhaps also in John.

The question of Philo's influence—particularly on the

letters of Paul, on Hebrews and on John—has been much discussed. One of the notable characteristics of Philo's writings is his use of allegory ("fancy," the modern reader is likely to say) in interpreting the Old Testament. Did Philo then serve as a model for Paul and for the author of Hebrews in passages where the same method of interpretation is used? (See *e.g.* 1 Cor. 9:9-10; 10:1-11; 2 Cor. 3:7-18; Gal. 3:16-19; 4:22-25; Heb. 7:1-25.) It may be so, but the conclusion does not necessarily follow. Philo did not invent this method of interpretation, nor did he have a monopoly on its use. We have seen that the scribes used it in their effort to make the old writings serve the detailed needs of their later day, and the Stoics to make the crude stories of primitive mythology somewhat palatable to cultured minds. It was deemed valid and useful by the most learned, as well as the most pious, men of the ancient world.

The question of the use of Philo by the author of the Fourth Gospel is too complicated for full discussion here. Philo uses the Logos as an expression for what we would call the *thought* of God, conceived as active, creative, sometimes (though not always) personal—a use which has obvious affinities with the Stoic use of the same term (cf. Chap. XIV). But what about the use in the prologue of John, where the pre-incarnate Jesus is called the Logos (Word)? The answer must be that if this Christian writer got his idea from Philo in any sense he certainly allowed himself much liberty in the use of it. His Logos is historical, and personal in a clear-cut sense. But on the whole it seems probable that the author of the Fourth Gospel was familiar with the Alexandrian Jewish philosophy of which Philo is the best known representative, and anyone who aspires to understand the Gospel will do well to study Philo as a preliminary discipline. Such study will at any rate help one to see some of the subtleties in a book which is generally

supposed to be far more simple than it really is. The reader of this Gospel "is surrounded by illusions which are not always obvious upon the surface." Its interpretation demands "a constant sensitiveness, especially to the deeper meaning which prompted the methods of contemporary religious speculation along the lines of the Alexandrian Jewish philosophy . . ." (Moffatt, *op. cit.*, 523).

As to the use by New Testament writers of works of pagan authors there is little evidence. The line of poetry incorporated in Paul's speech at Athens—"for we are also his offspring" (Acts 17:28)—may have been taken either from Aratus, who was from the province of Cilicia, as Paul was, or from the famous Hymn of Cleanthes, the second president of the Stoic school. It occurs in both. The uncomplimentary comment about the Cretans in Tit. 1:12—"Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, idle gluttons"—is apparently from the philosopher and poet Epimenides, who was attacking the claim that the island was the burial place of Zeus. He himself was a native of Crete. The saying, "Evil companionships corrupt good morals," in 1 Cor. 15:33, is also, in the Greek, a line of poetry, originally from Euripides or Menander. Some other passages embody what may be quotations from pagan Greek sources, but they are usually difficult to identify.

Of the New Testament writers probably Paul and Luke, at least, had some acquaintance with the great field of Greek literature, but if so the fact seems to have left but little trace in such of their writings as have come down to us. Probably it was less through reading than through personal contacts, and the intellectual and spiritual atmosphere of the world in which they moved, that Hellenism made its impress upon their outlook and point of view. In any case such literary influences as

reveal themselves in the New Testament are overwhelmingly from the Jewish side.

B. Some Literary Characteristics.

We shall here note some features which are characteristic of ancient writings in greater or less degree—including the writings of the New Testament—but which are comparatively unfamiliar to readers of modern books.

(a) *Interpolation.* One of these features is *interpolation*—the insertion or addition of matter which was not a part of the work as originally composed. The interpolated matter might be only a word or two, or it might be one or more paragraphs. The insertion or addition might be the work of the original author himself. More often it would be due to later re-editing, or to the unwillingness of copyists to allow what they deemed useful material to be lost.

It is not certain that any New Testament book has undergone re-editing by the author, though such may have been the case with the two works of Luke, possibly also with Romans and Mark. Of later re-editing involving interpolation there is a good deal of evidence. The last chapter of Romans, as we have it, almost certainly was not a part of the original epistle. The same may be said of the last four chapters of 2 Corinthians. The matter in question, in both cases, seems to have been written by the same author as the work to which it is attached—*i.e.* by Paul—but to have been given its present position at a later date. Two of the Gospels, Mark and John, have endings which seem not to be integral parts of the works themselves. In the case of John (Chap. 21) the ending may possibly have been written by the author; in the case of Mark (16:9-20) it certainly was not. It was natural that in the process by which certain fugitive Christian writings became a

"New Testament" (cf. Chap. VII)—the process of canonization, in other words—the writings should have undergone changes at some points. Material which was not independent, but which had approved itself as worthy to be preserved, was attached to some related work, while in some cases suitable endings were composed. Probably the New Testament books were more affected by the canonizing process than is generally realized.

Another influence was that of church use. The doxology to the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:13) may be cited as an example. The evidence of the early manuscripts shows that it was not a part of the original. It probably came into use as a liturgical response, and so found its way into copies of the Gospel in which the prayer, in its fullest form, was found.

The copyists, as has been said, were loath that anything edifying should be lost. If material was of doubtful authenticity they were likely to give it the benefit of the doubt. They preserved the story of Jesus' attitude toward the woman taken in adultery (John 7:53-8:11)—which is fortunate—and other bits of floating tradition and interpretation (such as John 5:4 and 1 John 5:7 in A. V.), the loss of which would not have been serious. Omission, except through accident, was less common and is harder to detect.

In the case of the Gospels the harmonizing tendency was much at work in the early period. Parallel passages after a few copyings were likely to become more closely parallel, phrases and sentences from one finding their way into another by accident or design. The Revised Version omits a good deal of this interpolated matter—usually single verses or parts of verses—which is found in the Authorized Version.

(b) *Misplaced Passages.* Related to interpolation, at least in the difficulties which it causes, is the phenomenon of genuine but *misplaced* passages—*i.e.* passages

which belong to the work in question but are out of their true connection. Reference has already been made (Chap. X) to Professor Moffatt's attempt to restore a number of New Testament passages to what he thinks was their original place (see *e.g.* in Moffatt's *New Translation,* Matt. 5:22; 7:19; John 3:22-30; 7:15-24; 10:19-29; 11:5, 18-19; 12:44-50; 15-16; 18:19-24; Acts 5:33; 10:24; 14:3; 26:8; Rom. 2:14-15; 7:25; 1 Cor. 14:33-36; James 4:11-12; 5:3; Rev. 7:5-6; 18:14; 20:14; with notes). Such rearrangement is based mainly on conjecture. In some cases it greatly improves the sense, whether or not it restores the original connection. Displacement, where such occurs, may have been due to careless copying, to misplacement of leaves of papyri, or to some more obscure cause.

With regard to the whole matter—interpolation, omission, and misplacement in the New Testament—two things should be realized. On the one hand, such changes occurred much more readily in ancient than in modern times. Hand-copying allowed much chance for involuntary alteration, but this was not all. The ethical standard, with regard to literary work, was entirely different. It was considered quite permissible to alter what another had written, indeed to use it, without apology or acknowledgement, in whatever way one might choose.

On the other hand, the practice did not, as a matter of fact, vitally affect the text of the New Testament. In all but a few of the cases the changes involved were slight; in no case were they vital to the history or the thought of the books concerned. The science of textual criticism—working on the very large apparatus of manuscripts which have survived—has enabled us to be confident that our New Testament is in substance the same as "the original."

(c) *Compilation.* We next come to *compilation,* a phenomenon which reveals itself in the Old Testament

in surprising degree, as modern scholarship has shown. The books from Genesis to Joshua are now known to be a complicated patchwork of materials from various sources and of a wide range of dates, and the same sort of structure appears in others of the books. It appears that among the Hebrews authorship very often was simply a matter of working over what someone else had written and adapting it to the need of the author's (or editor's) time and environment. Greek writers did the same thing, with the difference that having more of the artistic instinct they usually worked over the borrowed materials more thoroughly. The same may be said of numerous modern books, though the modern writer has to reckon with a sensitiveness about plagiarism which in the ancient world did not exist.

In the New Testament particularly interesting examples of compilation are to be seen in Matthew and Luke. Here two writers, probably working in entire independence of each other, have each compiled a book from sources which for the most part were the same. And by a fortunate circumstance the source most largely used—the one which in each case provided the framework for the new book—has itself come down to us (cf. Chap. V). Hence anyone who wishes to study the method at first hand has an admirable handbook for the purpose in one of the Gospel "Harmonies." And probably the most surprising thing which will emerge from such study in the case of most students will be the freedom with which Mark's material is handled by the writers of Matthew and Luke. The tradition about Jesus was still in a fluid state, though it was in the process of assuming fixity. Fragmentary records of deeds and sayings were being incorporated in more ambitious works, but as yet the door was open for the admission of fugitive material, oral as well as written, even when no particularly suitable place for it was available. Each writer selected, rejected,

and adapted as his own temperament and convictions dictated, or as seemed required by the need which he wished to meet. Mark himself, though probably with less use of written sources and more dependence on what he had heard (particularly Peter's preaching), had followed much the same course. The result was a group of related narratives in which facts about Jesus are more or less blended with early Christian understanding and interpretation of those facts. Both elements are valuable. The historical student must try to distinguish them, but happily for practical purposes such distinction is not a prime necessity.

Compilation on a less ambitious scale is to be seen in 2 Peter, which has been composed apparently on the basis of the little epistle which bears the name of Jude. As in the case of the Gospels, the writer has dealt freely with his source, adapting it to meet his needs. There is some ground for the opinion that Ephesians, in like manner, has been composed on the basis of Colossians, the compiler not being Paul but a later Paulinist. But here the evidence is less conclusive. It remains possible that Paul composed both at nearly the same time. Efforts have been made to show that compilation on a large scale is to be seen in John, but the demonstration has not been convincing. The question has come up, again, in the case of Revelation (with which we shall deal later) and of Acts.

In the latter part of Acts the author has apparently used as a source a diary of his own, kept when he was traveling with Paul (see above, Chap. V). For the opening chapters, having to do with early events in and about Jerusalem, his sources were obviously less direct. But opinion differs greatly as to what those sources were. He may have made use of one or more Aramaic documents, translating them into Greek, adapting them to his own need, and supplementing their account with

matter from his own diary; or the material in the opening chapters may have been gleaned mainly from stories which the author found current in Palestine when he visited the country, some thirty years later, with Paul. If he made large use of written sources he compiled them with more literary skill and smoothness than did some others of the Biblical historians. Since his antecedents were Hellenistic rather than Hebrew this would not be hard to understand.

The fact that the books of the Bible have to so large an extent been produced by the compilation process undoubtedly makes them harder for the average reader to understand—that is, for him to understand them as records of the past and sources for the history of religious progress. It is important that they should be so understood, and those who have the equipment for the necessary technical investigations must be given a free hand. Meanwhile the books as they stand have proved their capacity to minister richly to the religious needs of men.

(d) *Composition of Speeches.* The *composition of speeches* is another interesting phenomenon met with in ancient literature.

> The rhetorical element in ancient historiography naturally adopted the method of . . . bringing out the character of a person or the salient features of a situation by means of speeches. The author composed such a speech as appeared to him suitable for the occasion, drawing perhaps upon any materials of oral or written tradition that lay to his hand, but casting the speech into such forms as were apt to the setting chosen. The rival methods of indirect speech or of psychological analysis were open, but they were at once less dramatic and less easy. Tacitus commonly preferred the latter process, and there are cases of conscientious preference for the

> former; but the public life of the ancients, where so much of importance was transacted in and by speeches, led the majority of historians to adopt the method of composing speeches for their *dramatis personae* as the most intelligible and popular method of giving plastic expression to historical truth. The speech served as an analysis of character. It revealed the speaker, and rayed light on the situation more effectively than paragraphs of comment or analysis. (Moffatt, *op. cit.*, 42-43.)

Thucydides' remark as to his own method has often been quoted: "I have put into the mouth of each speaker the sentiments proper to the occasion, expressed as I thought he would be likely to express them, while at the same time I endeavored, as nearly as I could, to give the general purport of what was actually said" (1:22; Jowett's translation). Evidences of a similar procedure are to be found in the writings of Tacitus, Sallust, and other ancient historians. But naturally the proportion of authentic tradition, as over against imaginative composition, varied. In some cases the composed speech may have back of it an accurate record of the outline or substance of an actual speech; in other cases the author has had no source other than his general knowledge of the situation: for the rest his imagination is given free play.

In the New Testament speeches are particularly prominent in the Book of Acts. The longest is that of Stephen (7:2-53). Speeches of Peter occur with considerable frequency in the first part, and of Paul in the latter part, of the book. There is the speech of Gamaliel in 5:35-39, and that of the townclerk of Ephesus in 19:35-40, and direct quotations from one or other of the characters occur throughout. In general the author's method with regard to these speeches would seem to have been substantially that of Thucydides. They are

his own compositions, with varying amounts of explicit source material back of them. Some of Paul's speeches the author may himself have heard, and notes as to their content may have been preserved in his diary. For Stephen's speech we must suppose that a written source was available, otherwise so much space would scarcely have been devoted to it. The case of the doctrinal discourses in the opening chapters (mostly attributed to Peter) is more difficult. We have seen that the whole question of the sources underlying the first part of Acts is much in dispute. But however the author may have got the material for the construction of these discourses they "have every appearance of representing a doctrine which once was customary in the church. They need not be regarded as verbatim reports of what was said on the various occasions, but they correspond in a remarkable way with what must have been said in the earliest controversy with Judaism, and the teaching they contain no doubt went on for a long time on Jewish soil, and could still be heard in the latter part of the first century" (Menzies, in Peake's *Commentary,* 776).

In the Gospels formal speeches are not prominent, but the element of direct quotation, introduced in conversations and controversies, looms large. Probably the form of many of the sayings of Jesus thus handed down to us approximates closely to his original words. This would apply particularly to matter in the Synoptic Gospels which is reproduced from earlier written sources, such as some of the non-Markan material common to Matthew and Luke. But we have already seen how freely such matter was handled, in the course of transmission, during the early period. At the opposite extreme from the brief sayings and vivid parables of the Synoptic Gospels are the lengthy discourses of the Fourth Gospel, theological and mystical in character. These are perhaps best thought of as "prophetic and homiletical expansions of

authentic logia. The inspired prophet, speaking in the Lord's name, is not far from the preacher who develops a homily . . . this creative process, in which a mind brooding on some gospel word brings out an edifying monologue or dialogue, accounts for some passages in the synoptists as well as in the Fourth gospel more naturally than the hypothesis of deliberate literary inventiveness" (Moffatt, *op. cit.*, 43-44). The style of the discourses in the Fourth Gospel—uniform with that of the book as a whole—is itself sufficient to show that as they stand they are free compositions from the author's pen.

(e) *Pseudonimity.* Related to the custom of putting speeches into the mouths of historical characters was the practice of disguising the origin of a treatise, of one sort or another, which one might produce. The technical term is *pseudonymity.* The Jewish apocalypses, of which the Book of Daniel was the pioneer, were almost always circulated, not under the name of the real writer, but of some outstanding figure of an earlier day. The practice was extended also to the wisdom and poetic literature. Thus we have books bearing the names of Noah, Enoch, the Twelve Patriarchs, Solomon, Ezra, and various other ancient worthies, all of them written later than 200 B. C. Among the Jews of Alexandria, under Greek influence, pseudonymous epistles (*e.g.* the Epistle of Jeremiah) were produced.

In the New Testament 2 Peter provides the clearest example of pseudonymity. The epistle is written as if by Peter (see 1:14, 15, 17-18; 3:1), but there are conclusive reasons for holding that it was really produced long after the apostle's death (*cf.* above, Chap. VI). Due no doubt to the prominence of Peter in early Christian tradition a voluminous literature came to be attributed to him. In addition to the two epistles contained in our New Testament Eusebius (fourth century) was able to name four other works—the Acts of Peter, the Gospel

according to Peter, the Preaching of Peter, and the Apocalypse of Peter—which were connected with the apostle's name but which were not accepted as canonical by the church. As a matter of fact it is doubtful if Peter left any literary remains whatever, though the first epistle may possibly be genuine.

Other apostolic names also served as focal points for the accumulation of pseudonymous literature. It is at least very doubtful whether the canonical Epistle of James was produced in the time of the apostles, and other writings which bore the same name—as the "Protevangelium" and the "Liturgy" of James—certainly were not. To Paul are credited thirteen separate writings in the New Testament, and outside the canon are a miscellaneous collection of works—the Apocalypse of Paul, the correspondence between Paul and Seneca, etc. —all obviously pseudonymous. Of the thirteen writings in the New Testament three—1 and 2 Timothy and Titus —are generally thought to have been composed by a later "Paulinist." The same may be true of Ephesians, and some doubt also attaches to 2 Thessalonians and Colossians. The seven which remain include the important letters to the Romans, (two) to the Corinthians, and to the Galatians, all of them very generally conceded to be genuine. Through them we are able to know Paul pretty well—that is, his inner life. Fortunately he had something of the literary gift, which probably was denied to most of the earliest propagators of Christianity. As for John, it is to be noted that while five New Testament writings have the name in their titles, only in the case of one of the five, Revelation, is the name so used in the body of the work. In other words, only Revelation claims to have been written by John, and it does not claim explicitly to have been written by the Apostle John. In the case of this apostle, as of Peter, investigation leads to increasing doubt as to whether he engaged in

literary activities at all, or whether, if he did, any products of such activities survived. We are scarcely justified in going farther than to say that John may perhaps bear a relation to the Fourth Gospel similar to the relation (itself uncertain) of Peter to the Gospel which bears the name of Mark (cf. above, Chap. V).

How are we to account for the practice of which we have been speaking—the practice of circulating literary works under the names of great figures of the past? In the case of the Jewish apocalypses, from Daniel onward, at least a partial answer is to be found in the fact that by this time the canon of prophetic Scripture was supposed to be closed, the spirit of prophecy was theoretically and officially dead, the Law, as interpreted by the rabbis, was all-dominant. Actually, however, there were still writers who were inspired—or thought they were inspired—to utter a word from God. How were they to gain a hearing for that word—particularly if, as was likely enough to be the case, there was a challenge to orthodoxy in what they had to say? Through disguised authorship a way was found. It was the dominance of the past which these new prophets had to fight, and they fought it by summoning great names of the past to their aid.

A different sort of motive is found in

> the innocent admiration and naive sympathy which prompted a disciple to reproduce in his own language the ideas, or what he conceived to be the ideas, of his master, and yet forbade him, out of modesty, to present these under his own name. Conscious of the master's influence, disciples viewed their own writings as an extension of his spirit. In them, through their pages, he spoke, not they. . . . What they wrote was not so much a private venture or independent outburst of their own, as the propagation of his mind and spirit. Hence it became a

> point of unselfish piety to give up all claim to personal glory, and attribute their writings to the master himself. (Moffatt, *op. cit.*, 41.)

Such a practice was followed, for example, by writers of the later Pythagorean school of philosophy (see Zeller, *Pre-Socratic Philosophy,* I, 311f., cited by Moffatt).

It is entirely conceivable that this latter motive operated in the case of the Pastoral Epistles (1 and 2 Timothy and Titus) and also in the case of Ephesians and 2 Thessalonians if these are pseudonymous. In the case of 2 Peter it may be that the former of the two motives mentioned, or something like it, is to be discerned. For a generation or two after its birth Christianity possessed living inspiration and was conscious of the fact. Individual Christians spoke as the Spirit moved them, and were encouraged by their leaders so to do. But by the beginning of the second century the situation was changing. The new religion was itself coming under the dominance of the past, as Judaism had long been. 2 Peter clearly belongs to the second century, and the author's reason for assuming the name and standpoint of Peter may have been not only to express what he believed would have been the apostle's sentiments but also to gain prestige for his work by linking it up with the already classical apostolic age. This author, however, was not attacking orthodoxy; on the contrary he was supporting it as vigorously as he could.

Probably we should think of the two motives mentioned as scarcely more than starting points for the practice of pseudonymous authorship. Once started it proceeded by its own momentum, so to speak. It was in reality a clever and useful literary device. By the use of it the author of Daniel was able to assume a position some four centuries before the actual time of writ-

ing, in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (cf. above, Chap. XI), and from this vantage point to present the more effectively his interpretations of present dire events and his assurances of relief soon to come by throwing them into the dramatic form of predictive prophecy. In like manner the author of 2 Peter no doubt added to the effectiveness of his attack on current heresies by casting them into the form of a forecast, from the pen of a great apostle, of what "the last days" (3:3) would bring forth. The method has by no means outlived its vogue or its usefulness. In modern historical novels, as in plays such as Drinkwater's *Abraham Lincoln* or Shaw's *St. Joan,* we may see its great possibilities.

Incidentally the great historical novels and plays with which we are familiar will serve to remind us that the question of whether the original readers of ancient pseudonymous writings recognized them as fiction or regarded them as records of fact is not as important as we might otherwise think. Probably multitudes of readers took fiction for fact. Certainly Daniel, 2 Peter, and other similar works came in time to be regarded as really belonging to the periods and situations which they assumed, and it may be that in some cases the disguise was taken seriously from the first. But it is obvious that such disguise can serve its literary purpose—contributing to power and effectiveness, without being taken seriously.

(f) *Anonymity.* It is hard for us to avoid thinking of the practice of pseudonymous authorship as involving deception or trickery. We do not readily realize that among the Hebrews there was almost no such thing as pride in, and jealous guarding of, authorship. Except for the books of prophecy in the Old Testament and the Epistles in the New almost all the books of the Bible were originally *anonymous*—having no indication as to

who the author or compiler was. The authors' names attached to them in our titles had their origin in later tradition, not in names attached to original manuscripts. We have glimpsed this situation in previous chapters, and have seen something of the labor which it has made for Biblical scholarship. It is referred to here merely as a part of the background needed for an understanding of pseudonymity. Where little interest was felt either in proclaiming or in safeguarding authorship the fictitous appropriation of names would doubtless not be thought a moral offense.

In closing this sketch of literary characteristics it may be well to call attention to the fact that the use of language in the New Testament is not to be thought of as scientific, in the modern sense, but rather as what we would call *popular*. This applies not only to poetical and hortatory matter, but to historical narrative as well. There is a good deal of what we would call exaggeration if modern standards of history writing were applied. Mark, in picturing Jesus engaged in an evening of healing activities, says that "all the city was gathered together at the door" (1:33). He has previously said regarding John the Baptist's work that "there went out unto him all the country of Judaea, and all they of Jerusalem; and they were baptized of him . . ." (1:5). Such language is frequent throughout the book. In connection with Paul's experience in Athens the author of Acts has this comment: "Now all the Athenians and the strangers sojourning there spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or to hear some new thing" (17:21). Of course in all this there is no intent to deceive: it is simply that the use of language is popular. And no deception will result if we understand with what sort of diction we have to do. The danger is that Christian readers, having heard much stress placed on the historical trustworthiness of the New Testament writers,

will assume that their outlook, standards, and methods as historians, were those of the twentieth century. Such simple illustrations as those quoted serve to remind us that such was not—as of course it could not have been—the case. In the matter of historical standards, as in other matters, the books of the New Testament have their setting in the ancient, not the modern, world.

CHAPTER XVII

NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE: LITERARY TYPES

A. Gospels and Acts.

Our word "gospel" is a fairly literal translation of the Greek *euaggelion* (εὐαγγέλιον). The Greek word, as used by earlier writers from Homer down, means "reward for good news," but in the later Greek it came to be used of the "good news" itself. In the New Testament this later usage has been taken over and given a specific application—namely, to the good news which God gave to men through the person and work of Jesus the Christ. The word occurs sixty times in the thirteen writings which bear the name of Paul, seven times in Mark, four times in Matthew, twice in Acts, in 1 Peter and Revelation once each. It is in the main a Pauline term and in use is roughly equivalent to "Christianity," a term which did not come into use until after New Testament times. The use of the word gospel which is most common with us—*i.e.* as applied to certain *books*—does not occur in the New Testament. It arose soon after the New Testament period, just when or how we do not know. For a time the term was applied to the four canonical accounts of Jesus' life jointly. These books were now the medium through which the good news was known and transmitted, eye-witnesses having all passed away (cf. above, Chap. VII). But we find that very soon any one of the four had come to be thought of as itself a "gospel," and from that time to the present the word has indicated

a type of literature, a type which began and ended in the early centuries of Christian history.

Somewhat analogous works, it is true, have come down to us from antiquity. Two works often referred to as roughly parallel to the Synoptic and Johannine Gospels, respectively, are Xenophon's *Memorabilia* and Plato's *Apology* (cf. also the *Phaedo, Symposium,* etc.). Both have to do with the life of Socrates, who, like Jesus, left no writings of his own. As in the case of the Christian records, the two pictures differ markedly. In Plato, as in "John," the writer's own ideas are more or less inextricably interwoven with those of the master whom he depicts. Another work sometimes compared with the Gospels is the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana,* by Philostratus. Apollonius was a philosopher and reformer of pagan practices whose life extended nearly through the first century. He was frequently set up as a rival of Jesus by pagan opponents of Christianity in the early centuries. The *Life* (apparently written about 217 A. D.) is highly embellished, but contains a good deal that is probably fact. The narrative includes such features as a miraculous birth, healings, exorcisms, raising the dead, ethical teachings, translation to heaven, subsequent appearances, etc. Naturally it has pretty generally been regarded by Christians as a work composed as a counterblast to the Gospels, but this view is largely discarded by recent scholarship. Tacitus' *Life of Agricola* is another example of ancient attempts at biography, as is the *Life of St. Anthony* (or Antony) by Athanasius, written about 365 A. D. The latter is interesting as showing the very uncritical attitude taken by a learned and high-minded Christian writer of the early centuries toward his source materials. (But there is some doubt as to the authorship of this work.)

Had Mark, or the compilers of the "Sayings" of Jesus later used in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke,

ever read Xenophon's *Memorabilia* or Plato's *Apology?* It is possible, but we see no evidence of their having been in any way influenced by these works. Influence from the Jewish side is more probable. The particular line which Mark chose to follow in choosing and mapping out his materials may have been suggested to him by his familiarity with the Elijah-Elisha cycle of stories in the Jewish Scripture and Tradition. Similar features are to be seen in the opening call, the emphasis on miracles rather than preaching, etc. Mark presents Jesus as a prophet of the Elijah type, though of course a greatly superior example of the type. Again, we may think of such Jewish works as the Proverbs of Solomon, the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), etc., as furnishing the idea for early Christian compilations of Sayings of Jesus. It is doubtful if there was any conscious imitation of these works. The incentives of which the Christian compilers were conscious would be of a practical rather than a literary sort. Yet the fact that the Jews were wont to preserve and hand down sayings attributed to their sages is worthy of note.

On the biographies of antiquity Gilbert Murray has this to say:

> Biography of a sort began when the disciples of Aristotle and Epicurus exerted themselves to find out and record the lives of their masters. But biography in our sense—the complete writing of a life year by year with dates and documents—was never practiced at all in antiquity. Think of the Gospels, of the Acts, even of Tacitus' *Life of Agricola.* They are different from one another, but they are all unlike any modern biography in their resolute indifference to anything like completeness. Ancient "Lives" as a rule select a few great deeds, a few great sayings or discourses; they concentrate upon the last

> years of their subject, and often especially upon his death. (*Euripides and His Age,* 20f.)

But in the case of the Gospels one other dominant characteristic in addition to their "indifference to anything like completeness" must be pointed out. No doubt it is to be found, in varying degrees, in other ancient "Lives" as well; in any case it needs to be recognized by present-day readers who have the methods and standards of modern biography in mind. This characteristic is that in the Gospels the practical interest is primary: the historical interest has only a secondary place. The Gospels, as well as the epistles, "are essentially works of edification and not historical works" (Berguer, *Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus,* 88). On this Jülicher has some pertinent remarks:

> The Gospels cannot be called historical books if the term be interpreted as applying solely to books which owe their entire origin either to a mere love of narrative, or to the scientific impulse to recall the past, or to the wish to gain insight into the interdependence of past events and to pass judgment upon them. The same may be said of the Acts. The Gospels were written first and foremost for edification—to supply the need of the community which grounded its faith on the words, deeds and sufferings of Jesus, and which could not let the recollection of these things—the basis of its existence—be covered up or dimmed. The object of the Gospels was to arouse and keep forever living the *faith in Jesus Christ,* to be a substitute for, or perhaps an accompaniment to, the personal preaching of the missionary, and they were also of great use to the primitive Christian in apology and controversy. (*Introduction to the New Testament,* 294-295.)

But it by no means follows that the New Testament Gospels are not in any sense or degree historical.

> They pursued their object through the medium of historical materials, and preserved the narrative form of writing; therefore, in spite of their overwhelming religious *tendency* they still have a claim to the title of historical books, at least as much as the books of the Maccabees, and more than the "Life of St. Anthony" of Athanasius . . . A religious intention must indeed necessarily influence a writer's choice of material, but it need not prevent him from telling the truth. Luke certainly claimed to be an historian, and all four Gospels have at least as much right to be included in the literature of history as many a modern "Life of Christ." (*Ibid.*)

If we remember that these writings "were written first and foremost for edification," and keep in mind the methods and standards of writers of the time, we shall not have great difficulty in orienting ourselves with respect to the question of the Gospels as history. They are not works of history, in the strict modern sense, but source books from which, through scientific study, authentic history is derived.

We may venture a descriptive definition at this point. Gospel: a name applied to certain early Christian writings in which more or less fragmentary and detached accounts of events in the life of Jesus, together with other fragments of his teachings, have been cast into literary form by editors of a later generation, the purpose being not so much to preserve records for posterity as to provide guidance for living Christians, to commend the new faith to non-adherents, and to refute the calumnies of enemies.

Such are the gospels in general. (I refrain from special comment on the non-canonical gospels. All those

known to us seem to have been secondary in character, deriving both their method and their material either from the canonical Gospels or from sources of inferior worth.) It remains that something be said as to the different types of Gospels in the New Testament.

The most obvious distinction here is that between the Synoptic and the Johannine type, a distinction which even the least sophisticated in literary criticism cannot entirely miss. Both—or rather all—are gospels, as defined above, but the fragments of events and teachings found in the Fourth Gospel are for the most part different from those in the Synoptic Gospels, and the editorial viewpoint in handling the materials is also, for the most part, different. In general it may be said that the Fourth Gospel's chief interest is in Jesus himself, in his unique relation to God and to man. It is in the coming to earth of such a Person that the "good news," to this writer consists. To the Synoptic writers, on the other hand, the *work* of Jesus is the important thing—the new order from God which he ushers in.

Still it is possible to exaggerate this difference. The notion that in the Synoptic Gospels we have a rigidly objective narrative, while the Fourth Gospel provides a spiritual interpretation, is far from being true to the facts. Moffatt remarks that "The synoptics, as well as the Fourth gospel, were written ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν [from faith to faith]. The motto of John 20:31 would apply to all the three, but in a special sense to Mark; for, in spite of the difference of angle from which Mark and John view the messianic dignity of Jesus, both aim at demonstrating that he was the Son of God" (*Int.* 541). The fact is that at a very early date in Christian history —almost from the time of Jesus' death, it would seem— the gospel *about* Jesus displaced the gospel *of* Jesus in interest. It is striking how little interest in the teachings of Jesus, and how much interest in the significance of his

person and mission, is shown in the writings of Paul and in Acts. And in both Mark and John—though the matter is less plain on the surface—the same interest is really dominant. In Mark Jesus is the divinely appointed head of a new order, in "John" the Logos of God in human flesh. In both cases what Jesus said is introduced less for its inherent significance than for what it was thought to contribute to the developing doctrine as to who and what this Jesus was.

Happily, however, in another source, or group of sources—the so-called "Logia" of Matthew-Luke—we are able to get closer to Jesus the teacher, to get a clearer idea of what sort of "good news" it was which he himself proclaimed.

It is well, therefore, that in addition to the familiar distinction between the Synoptic and the Johannine types of gospel material, we should give attention also to another distinction—between the Mark-John type and the type seen particularly in the non-Markan matter of Matthew and Luke, in other words between the material designed mainly to show what Jesus was and that concerned more directly with what he taught. It is not a hard and fast distinction. There is sayings material, not unlike that of the Logia, to be found in Mark and John; and a passage like Matt. 11:27-30 (cf. Luke 10:22) serves to remind us that the Fourth Gospel is not alone in putting into the mouth of Jesus himself words setting forth his uniqueness as God's Son. Yet along broad lines the distinction has both validity and usefulness.

Within the past generation or two there has been a decided tendency, at least in the ranks of scholarship, to disparage the value of the material in the Gospels which presents what we have called the gospel about Jesus, and to assume that in the study of these documents the discovery of the actual message of Jesus himself was the one all-important quest. At present, however, this view is

less prevalent. Not that there is a renewed disposition to fall back on the New Testament gospel about Jesus as infallible and final in all its details. Such a tendency is not discernible. What is now seen is rather that the *words* of Jesus do not sum up his whole significance, much less embrace the whole meaning and content of Christianity. In turning attention from his teachings to himself—in trying to evaluate such a personality, to weigh its significance, to estimate its relation to man, to God, to the problem of life—the early church, after all, was on the right track. From the Golden Rule to the proposition that God is to be seen in Jesus was doubtless a long step; but the first generation of Christians took it, and the present generation sees, perhaps more clearly than some of its predecessors, how fatal the loss would be if we were to surrender the proposition and take as our sole standard the Golden Rule. Priceless indeed are the Sayings, preserved by Matthew and Luke; but the Mark-John type of gospel has had, and still has, a vital rôle to play.

The main points which have been advanced with regard to the Gospels apply also to the Book of Acts. It too has obviously been written "from faith to faith," in the sense that its author was a Christian believer who sought to confirm and propagate in others what he himself believed. It, too, is fragmentary, and lacking in the balance and proportion which we find in modern works of history. It differs from the Gospels in that one figure is not the center of interest throughout; yet Mark is scarcely more a biography of Jesus than is the latter part of Acts a biography of Paul. It is to be remembered that the author himself did not give the title *The Acts,* or *The Acts of the Apostles,* to this book. It is a misleading title and tends to give the impression that the book is a distinct sort of literary effort more than is really the case. It is an account of the career of Paul as a

propagator of Christianity up to the time of his arrival, a prisoner, in Rome—the account being prefaced by a number of incidents connected with the rise of the Christian movement in Jerusalem and its spread into the Gentile world. In these preliminary narratives Peter plays a somewhat prominent rôle. Other apostolic figures are very shadowy.

We can easily think of several ways in which these writings—Gospels and Acts—might have been different. They might have been more complete. Would that have been an advantage? It is not clear that it would. We may suppose that it would have resulted in the notion of a literalistic, mechanical following of Jesus and the primitive church being carried farther than is now the case. And that is not to be desired. They might have been more critical as to historical facts. Would that have been an advantage? After all, *truth,* not facts, is the vital thing, and to attempt to base religion primarily on history is to entertain a delusion as to what religion is. They might have been more objective, less affected by the practical religious needs which they were intended to serve. Is this a loss? On the contrary—since it is still, and always, practical religious needs which they can best serve and should serve—it is rather a gain.

Jülicher says that the Gospels have at least as much title to be called "historical" as has many a modern "Life" of Christ. We may supplement this with the remark that they also have at least as much religious effectiveness. They have a way of outlasting the centuries that no "Life" has been able to emulate.

B. Epistles.

We have seen that among Greek and Roman historians the free composition of speeches as an aid in carrying on the narrative was a recognized literary device. We have now to note that with the same purpose and in much

the same way letters also were composed and ascribed to persons who figured in the narrative. Occasionally a real letter to which the historian had access, would be transcribed. It is not possible to say with certainty to which class the two letters incorporated in the Book of Acts (15:23-29 and 23:26-30) belong. It is rather probable that both have been composed by the author of the book, who aimed thus to bring the situations before his readers the more vividly.

Philosophical writers, and others whose products were in the nature of discussion rather than narrative, made even larger use of the epistle-composing device. Frequently they tried to give greater vividness—a more personal touch—to what they wrote by presenting it in letter form. What was really a treatise, an essay, a tract, or an "article" they would send forth in the guise of a letter to a friend. If the the writer was a teacher accustomed to lecturing to pupils in a familiar oral fashion, or to carrying on philosophical discussions with a circle of followers as Socrates is said to have done, he would probably choose the epistolary form as the most natural method of putting his thoughts in written form. If it was desired to carry on the discussion at length a series of these "letters" could be composed. Such is the case with Seneca's letters, which are addressed to Lucilius, a friend of the author's, but which are really a collection of essays—"dispersed meditations," as Lord Bacon says.

But it is to be remembered that a philosopher was likely to write real letters to real friends at times. Would they differ absolutely from the treatises in letter form of which we have been speaking? Or would the philosopher be likely to philosophize somewhat even in writing a personal letter to a friend? Undoubtedly at times he would—and did. So, for example, with the correspondence of Epicurus, which Professor Moffatt thinks "marks a distinct stage in this literary evolution" (*op. cit.*, 48).

His letters to other philosophers, and to less distinguished individuals, had in some cases "only a semi-private object," such subjects as natural philosophy, astronomy, and ethical problems being discussed as well as matters more personal.

And of course in ancient as in modern times great numbers of letters were written which were purely personal and dealt only with matters of temporary and limited interest. Naturally there was less reason for these letters to be preserved than for the letters of Epicurus or the epistolary essays of Seneca. But by chance—through being hermetically sealed in sand-covered Egyptian rubbish heaps—multitudes of them were preserved and in our own time have been brought to light. They are business letters, family letters, letters of consolation, etc. —real letters in the strictest sense, few of them having any hint of "epistolary" character. They enable us to see what the letters of the Hellenistic world were like—letters free from connection with the art of literature.

To sum up: Writings in letter form which have come down to us from the world which produced the New Testament may be grouped under three general heads: (1) Real letters, as those of the Egyptian papyri; (2) Epistles, *i.e.* discussions or treatises cast in letter form; and (3) an intermediate group, such as the semi-private letters of Epicurus—real letters to friends or acquaintances, yet taken up largely with discussion such as is found in treatises or books. The three merge into each other more or less.

We have now something of a background for estimating the literary character of the Biblical epistles, which embrace all but six of the writings of the New Testament. "The letters of Paul are not literary; they are real letters, not epistles; they were written by Paul not for the public and posterity, but for the persons to whom they were addressed. Almost all the mistakes that have ever been

made in the study of St. Paul's life and work have arisen from neglect of the fact that his writings are non-literary and letter-like in character." So writes Deissmann (*Light from Anc. East,* 225). He has said much of the same tenor elsewhere. And on the whole it has been a good thing to have said. The tendency to think of Paul as writing systematic theology, after the post-Reformation fashion, was certainly all wrong. It was well for us to be reminded that what Paul wrote was dictated in large measure by the temporary and local situation which he had in view.

But Deissmann erred in failing to allow for an intermediate type of epistolary composition. It is an error to think of Romans or Philippians as works of systematic theology; but it is fully as great an error to think of them as parallel to the letters of the Egyptian farmer Gemellus, who writes admonitions about the flooding of the oliveyards and the proper care of certain little pigs. The letters of Epicurus furnish a closer parallel. Doubtless Paul and the famous philosopher were different in many respects, but they were alike in that each had a mind which was wont to grapple with great things, and a work which provided great things for the mind to grapple with. In the case of such a man even a letter to a friend is not likely to be commonplace. It is highly improbable that Paul ever thought of his letters as destined to become "Scripture," yet we should not too hastily assume that he thought of what he wrote as limited, in its application and value, to the situations and needs of those directly addressed. It is of interest to note that in the opening salutation of 1 Corinthians—a letter devoted in the main to the practical problems of a particular Christian community—he addressed himself not only "unto the church of God which is at Corinth" but also to "all that call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ *in every place.*" The range from

Romans to Philemon is wide, yet there is no contribution of Paul's to our New Testament which is entirely free either from the warm personal touch of the letter or from the impress of a great soul and a great mission, such an impress as can give to the humblest writings a place in world literature.

Hebrews and 1 Peter also may be classified as intermediate, though leaning rather more than Paul's letters toward the "epistle" type. Both writers seem to have distinct groups and situations in mind, but groups and situations with which they themselves have not been in particularly intimate contact. Hence there are occasional personal touches, but in the main what is written gives the impression of hortatory treatises cast in the letter form. Of the remaining New Testament writings of this general class James, 2 Peter, and 1 John may be classed with the epistles, while 2 and 3 John stand at the opposite extreme. Like Paul's letter to Philemon they have but little of the aspect of a treatise and much of the aspect of a personal note. In the case of 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus, and the other writings which have some appearance of being "Pauline" rather than by Paul (Ephesians, 2 Thessalonians, Colossians; cf. above, Chap. XVI) there is more or less ground for the judgment that we are dealing with treatises, the letter form being a literary disguise. The question of literary form is bound up with the question of authorship. But 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus would seem, at least, to embody material from real letters of Paul's. The references to "the cloak that I left at Troas," to "the books, especially the parchments," to "Alexander the coppersmith" who "did me much evil," etc. (2 Tim. 4:13-14) are strongly suggestive of the sort of matter which real letters contain.

The distinctions with which we have been dealing are real and important, but it would be possible to make too

much of them. These twenty-one writings, after all, are of one type—and it is a remarkably effective type. The letter form, whether spontaneous or assumed, has facilitated such a combination of interpretation and discussion, on the one hand, and concrete application and direct appeal, on the other hand, as has added greatly to the value of both elements. The writers doubtless builded better and with more permanence than they knew. They were doing what was for them the day's work, but it was destined to outlast the day.

C. Apocalyptic.

Apocalyptic literature is "revelation literature," but revelation of a particular sort, as we shall see. The author of the New Testament Book of Revelation himself provides the title for his book. He calls it, in substance, "A Revelation from Jesus Christ (having to do with things shortly to happen) to His Servant John, Who Here Testifies to What He Saw" (1:1-2). The word here translated "revelation" is *apokalupsis* (ἀποκάλυψις) the term from which our words "apocalyptic" and "apocalypse" come. This is the only apocalyptic book in the New Testament, though fragments of the same type of literature are to be found here and there incorporated in Gospels and epistles, while ideas resembling those characteristic of the apocalyptic writers are expressed in almost every book (see *e.g.* Mark 13; Matt. 24-25; Luke 21; 1 Thess. 4:13ff.; 2 Thess. 2:1ff.; 1 Cor. 7:29ff.; 15:21ff.; 2 Cor. 12:1ff.; etc.). We have seen that the Apocalypse of Peter and the Shepherd of Hermas (a work of this class) came near to maintaining themselves as Scripture in some circles of the early church. In the Old Testament we have the apocalyptic point of view and method forecasted in Ezekiel and given fuller expression in Daniel. The latter is usually regarded as the pioneer apocalypse. But the most numerous exam-

ples are found in the late Jewish literature (200 B. C.-100 A. D.) outside the Old Testament. Here we have 1 Enoch, 2 Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, 4 Ezra, the Apocalypse of Baruch, together with other works—such as the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Sibylline Oracles—of related character. In other literature analogies are to be seen in visions of the realm of the dead such as those of Homer, Virgil, Dante, and Milton, but it is to the Jewish apocalypses that we must look if we would see where Christian writers found models for works of this character.

In Old Testament prophecy, such as we have in the books of Isaiah and Jeremiah, there are two main elements—ethics and eschatology. The prophet, feeling himself to be God's spokesman, uttered admonitions as to present duty; and with the admonitions he coupled promises, or threats, as to what the morrow would bring forth. Such utterance was originally oral, but it came to assume written form. What happened in later centuries seems to have been that the two streams which in prophecy had intermingled began to take each its separate course. The ethical note found expression more particularly in what is called the Wisdom literature, the Book of Proverbs being the chief Old Testament representative, while in apocalyptic the eschatological emphasis was upheld.

Apocalyptic, then, is to be thought of as a later development of prophecy—a one-sided development, yet not unimportant on that account. The apocalypses were "tracts for hard times." The Book of Daniel has as its background the severe persecutions which the Jews suffered under Antiochus Epiphanes, while the Apocalypse of Baruch and 4 Ezra reflect the overthrow of Jerusalem in 70 A. D. The Book of Revelation was called forth by Roman persecutions of the Christians, being written apparently in Domitian's reign. Such situations, as seen

by these contemporary writers, were too desperate for human remedies. Where the prophet urged reform the apocalyptist proclaimed the speedy intervention of God. His visions of the future, therefore, were not in the nature of abstract dreamings, but had a very definite relation to what was going on in his world. And the future of his visions was not, in the main, a distant future. There would have been little comfort in that. It was a future which he saw near at hand. In Revelation the announcement at the beginning that "the time is at hand," and the "I come quickly" at the close, give the writer's outlook as to the time of the events which he depicts.

Moreover the fact that eschatology had become the dominant note with these writers did not mean that ethics had no importance for them. The great future events which they saw so near required preparation—ethical preparation—on the part of those who would have a happy participation in them. The ethical note is not lacking in the Jewish apocalypses, and in the apocalyptic matter in the New Testament it is prominent. The author of Revelation says repeatedly that when the divine intervention comes each one's "works" shall determine his destiny, and a characteristic of the New Testament as a whole is the way in which its writers use the expectation of Christ's speedy return as an incentive to a good life on the part of his followers.

As a type of literature apocalyptic is peculiar; at least it seems so to us. In the last chapter we noted its use of pseudonymity. Two other notable characteristics are the *prevalence of visions* and the *use of earlier materials*. Visions are found in the works of the earlier prophets, but to nothing like so great an extent. In Amos, Isaiah, and Jeremiah they occur but rarely. In Ezekiel, the forerunner of the apocalypses, they are more frequent. In Daniel and Revelation, as every Bible reader knows,

a large part of the material is presented in vision form. Some of the visions perhaps were actual occurrences; many others, no doubt, are merely a literary "dress." The case is similar to that of the speeches and letters in such a book as Acts (see above, Chap. XVI). The other characteristic—what may be called the borrowing tendency—is a little less visible on the surface, yet may be easily observed. The author of Daniel has made frequent use of ideas and figures taken from earlier Old Testament writings, while in 1 Enoch the Book of Daniel itself has been used extensively. Any reader with a marginal reference Bible may note for himself something of the very great dependence of Revelation on earlier materials. It has borrowed from Isaiah, Zechariah, Ezekiel, Enoch, but from Daniel most of all. I have noted eleven distinct expressions or concepts, used one or more times in Revelation, which are taken from the seventh chapter of Daniel alone. Very likely there are more.

From the point of view of present value and use this borrowing characteristic has aspects that are both fortunate and unfortunate. The imagery of the Book of Revelation has been enriched through its borrowing, and in the main the Jewish ideas taken over with the imagery were worthy of the prestige thus given to them. But the veiled allusions are often confusing to us who lack the key to them, and they are likely to be interpreted in ways that are neither historically correct nor practically profitable. And the borrowed ideas were not in every case such as harmonize readily either with a scientific world-view or with a spiritual conception of Christianity. This may be said, for example, of the notion of a "millennium" (Rev. 20:1-10), and of a coming judgment of highly vindictive character (cf. 19:11-21; 21:8; 22:15; etc.).

If the apocalyptic element in our Scriptures is to be properly understood and profitably used (or, to state it more modestly, if we are to avoid the gross misunder-

standing and misuse of it) the first essential is that we should view it as what it is—an expression of indomitable faith. The forms of expression which the faith found for itself may not appeal to us. The lack of logical sequence; the manner, far from scientific, in which old prophetic materials are re-worked; the elaborate cryptic imagery through which hopes, aspirations and denunciations are expressed; above all the way in which the apocalyptist's grateful assurance of divine deliverance for himself and his group is accompanied by exultation at the imminent downfall and frightful suffering awaiting the opposing group—such accompaniments might have been expected to obscure the faith itself. But they have not. It is a safe guess that almost anyone who will try the experiment of reading the Book of Revelation through rapidly at a single sitting will be surprised at how little the obscurities and incongruities really get in the way, and how powerful in its sweep the book as a whole is. "Great and marvelous are thy works, O Lord God, the Almighty; righteous and true are thy ways, thou King of the ages. Who shall not fear, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy; for all the nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy righteous acts have been made manifest" (15:3-4). Thus the author cries, out of his experience of suffering. And it may be questioned whether any other writer has ever made the faith which the cry voices more real than has he.

Into details of interpretation we cannot enter here. Each apocalypse is to be understood in the light of the contemporary situation which called it forth. In the case of Revelation this means the persecution of Christians by the Roman government, the chief excuse being their refusal to participate in the worship of the emperor. This forms the background of the frequent references to martyrs and martyrdom. Many have already suffered death for the Faith. It is this writer's task to strengthen

the hearts of those who remain by proclaiming that the day of deliverance for themselves and judgment upon their enemies is at hand (see 1:9; 6:9-11; 7:13-17; 14:13; 16:6; 18:24; 19:2; 20:4; etc.). Some of the visions are obviously intended for the encouragement of the sufferers (see *e.g.* 7:1-12; 10:1-11:13; 12:1-12). The beast of Chapters 13, 17, etc., is clearly the Roman Empire, and the harlot represented in Chapter 17 as sitting upon the beast is evidently the city of Rome. In various chapters Rome—the city or the empire—is referred to under the name of Babylon (see 13:1-8; 14:8; 16:10, 11, 19; 17; 18; 19:2-3, 19-20; 20:10). Back of the second beast of Chapter 13 and the false prophet of 16:13; 19:20; and 20:10 is to be seen the emperor-worship cult. The enigmatic "666" of 13:18 may refer to Nero, and there are a couple of apparent reflections of the widespread belief that that ruler would return from the dead (see 13:3; 17:8). From references to the Euphrates (9:14; 16:12) it is perhaps to be inferred that the author expected the Parthians (who occupied territory beyond that river) to be the instruments of the divine judgment upon Rome.

Regarding the book's outlook toward the future something has already been said. Prediction has a large place in its contents, but it is for the most part prediction of events which the seer believes are to happen soon. First there is to be a series of catastrophes leading to the fall of the Roman Empire, attended of course with the collapse of the emperor-worship cult. (These anticipations find expression in the visions of the seals, the trumpets, and the bowls, which make up the greater part of the matter of Chapters 5-16, and in the supplementary visions of Chapters 17-19.) And this will be followed speedily by the binding of Satan himself, since Rome is regarded as the embodiment of Satan's power on earth (see 19:19-20:3). But it develops that Satan's imprisonment is not

to be permanent: at the end of a thousand years he must be released for a time. Meanwhile the martyrs will live and reign with Christ. At the close of the "millennium" Satan will resume his career, but he will soon be conquered and eternal torment will henceforth be his lot (20:4-10). It is only after this thousand-year interim that we come to the real "last things"—the resurrection and judgment, the new heaven and earth, and the New Jerusalem (20:11-22:5).

The idea of an interim period was a comparatively late development in apocalyptic. The conception of the Book of Daniel is that the Messianic Kingdom when once established shall endure forever; indeed no other conception appears in the Old Testament (see Dan. 2:44; 7:27). When, later, the notion of a temporary triumph of righteousness arose there was at first no general agreement as to how long the period would be. In 4 Ezra its duration is set at four hundred years. It is in 2 Enoch that the thousand-year period first appears. This author sees in the Genesis story of creation not only an account of how the world came to be but also a forecast of its history. In common with other Jewish and early Christian writers he reckons that a world-day is equal to a thousand years (Ps. 90:4; cf. 2 Pet. 3:8). Therefore as God created the world in six days and rested the seventh day, so at the end of the first six thousand years of the world's history should come a thousand years of rest. Such seems to be the conception of 2 Enoch. It was reproduced in the New Testament only in this one passage in Revelation, where the statement is brief and restrained. Later Christian writers developed it with much extravagance.

It has been the Greek view of the future, rather than the Hebrew view, which has won the acceptance of the modern world. We look for the working out of the divine purpose not through sudden, cataclysmic interventions but through the progressive improvement of human soci-

ety. But there is value also in the Hebrew view. It gives vivid expression to a faith which is easily lost sight of when we stress the other point of view—the faith in a God whose nature is not adequately expressed by the name Destiny or Law; a God who not only guides but loves, not only rules but overrules.

D. Poetry and Rhythmic Prose in the New Testament.

A word on this subject, by way of appendix to the chapter, may be worth while. To begin with, we have to note that a great deal of the Old Testament matter in the New Testament (cf. Chap. XVI) is poetry. This applies of course to quotations from the "Poetical Books"—Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Canticles, Lamentations—but not to these alone. There is much poetry also in the matter taken from the historical and prophetic books. The New Testament revisers took a long step in the direction of printing poetical quotations as poetry. "Such an arrangement [they say] will be found helpful to the reader; not only as directing his attention to the poetical character of the quotation, but as also tending to make its force and pertinence more fully felt" (Preface to R. V. of 1881). Some of the more recent translators and editors have gone much farther than the revisers did in introducing typographical devices for distinguishing poetry. It is not surprising that the practice shows much variation, since it is often difficult to draw the line between prose and poetry.

What is to be said as to original Christian poetry in the New Testament? We think at once of the four specimens in Luke 1-2—the "Magnificat," the "Benedictus," the "Gloria," and the "Nunc Dimittis." But are these of Christian origin, or are they examples of Jewish poetry more or less reworked? There is certainly a lack of dis-

tinctively Christian features, but the same may be said of the Epistle of James. Harnack thinks that they are not only of Christian origin but that Luke himself composed them, purposely imitating the archaic style of Hebrew poetry (*Luke the Physician,* 214-18). But this seems improbable, Luke being a Gentile. It is more likely that they are Jewish Christian products, found by Luke in an Aramaic source, which he translated and adapted to his use. The view that the Magnificat was extemporized by Mary—and so with the others—is now seen to be untenable. If they are really of Christian origin they show how very like primitive Christian poetry was—in form, content, and spirit—to Hebrew poetry (cf., *e.g.,* the Song of Hannah in 1 Sam. 2:1-10).

Moffatt finds a number of fragments of early Christian hymns embedded in the Pauline epistles; *e.g.* 1 Tim. 3:16 and 2 Tim. 2:11-12. He considers that "the hymns of the Apocalypse . . . are further instances of Christian song" (*Int.,* p. 58). As evidence for the use of song in early Christian worship (though not necessarily of original compositions) we may cite Col. 3:16; Eph. 5:19; 1 Cor. 14:15, 26. Pliny, in an often-quoted passage (*Ep.* 10:96) makes mention of antiphonal singing among the Christian congregations. "The early church, for all its defects, had not yet lost sight of the truth that any creed worthy of acceptance should be fit for use in the praise and worship of believing men" (Moffatt, *op. cit.,* 58, referring particularly to 1 Tim. 3:16).

As to rhythmic prose a great deal might be said. The term serves as a convenient designation for a sort of intermediate type of literature, essentially poetic in substance, but, according to accepted standards, not fully poetic in form. The production of such prose in ancient times was perhaps favored by the fact that literary works were then destined to be heard more than read.

> The so-called metrical prose . . . passed from the Asiatic school of rhetoric with some of the Roman authors, such as Seneca, Pliny, and Cicero, who managed to preserve ease and freedom under a more or less conscious recognition of certain general but unwritten laws of rhythm and diction. The existence of this rhythmic element need not be supposed to impair necessarily the spontaneity of a writing. Ancient standards of composition admitted, even in writings of fresh and apparently unstudied grace, such as Cicero's letters of consolation, a scrupulous attention to the niceties of rhythm, cadence and accent, and a care for the laws of sound in style which may seem strained and hyper-ingenious to modern tastes. (Moffatt, *op. cit.*, 55-56.)

The New Testament writings "were composed and employed to edify the Christian communities. . . . But some at least of them, like many earlier works in classical literature, are instances of how style and fervor were not incompatible, and how they were meant to catch the hearer's heart, as the Christian message fell effectively upon his ears" (*ibid.*).

Even in such of the New Testament writings as Matthew's gospel and the letters of Paul—which show little of the conscious attention to style to be seen in Cicero or Seneca—examples of poetic prose are numerous. The sayings of Jesus, as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels, often show the parallelism of thought which characterizes Old Testament poetry. "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth" (Matt. 12:30); "For whosoever would save his life shall lose it: and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake shall find it" (Matt. 16:25). In such passages the familiar cadences of Psalms and Proverbs strike our ears.

In Paul's writings the matter is made more complex by the fact that Greek as well as Hebrew influences have made themselves felt. Greek prose writers made use of a parallelism of their own—a parallelism of form rather than thought. They balanced words of like sound against each other, constructed sentences so as to secure rhythmic stress, made use of refrains, etc. But it will be seen that such characteristics are less easily preserved in translation than is the case with the Hebrew parallelism of thought. This accounts, in a measure, for the rather elusive impression which an English rendering of 1 Cor. 13 makes on a reader who is sensitive to music in language. It is obviously poetic, from beginning to end, yet the specific poetic elements which one can point out seem inadequate to account for the impression made by the whole. In the Greek, however, the poetic character of the diction and structure is much more evident. The King James Version reproduces the poetic form well in some verses, in others not so well. The Greek of verse 7 reads: *panta stegei, panta pisteuei, panta elpizei, panta hupomenei.* The balance is well preserved in the rendering, "Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." But in the next verse the translators have been less successful, as can be seen from the following: Greek—*"Hē agapē oudepote piptei. eite de prophēteiai, katargēthēsontai. eite glōssai, pausontai. eite gnōsis, katargēthēsetai";* English—"Charity never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away." The English "prophecies," "tongues," and "knowledge" do not balance each other as do the Greek "prophēteiai," "glōssai," and "gnōsis"; nor do the verbs "fail," "cease," and "vanish away" have any such rhythmic sequence as have the Greek verbs which they translate. Yet I do not know

that any other translators have done better, from this point of view. It is not always possible to render both meaning and expression with entire faithfulness.

"How far Paul was conscious of such traits of composition and style, it is impossible to say. Their presence is due doubtless to his early training in the schools; probably they had become a second nature to him" (Moffatt, *Int.*, p. 89). Did he *dictate* 1 Cor. 13? Apparently he did (see 16:21). It would be hard to find another example of spontaneous literary art to compare with it.

CHAPTER XVIII

NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY: JESUS—BIRTH AND EARLY LIFE

A. Introductory: Sources.

First a word of introduction to Chapters XVIII-XXIII, which have to do with "New Testament History." We have seen that the Gospels and Acts are not works of history, in the modern sense, but that they are source books, of very great value, from which history is to be derived. The other New Testament writings also, though they contain but little narrative, yield much of value in the way of source materials for history; this is true of Paul's letters in particular. Supplementary sources are also available, as, for example, Josephus, and other extra-Biblical writings—Jewish, pagan, and Christian. This mass of materials has been exhaustively studied and scientifically sifted in modern times. Many points are still in doubt, and there is much work yet to be done. Yet it is now possible, at any rate, to present New Testament history not only more consecutively and systematically but also more clearly than it is presented in the New Testament books themselves. Such a presentation is attempted in these chapters. It is of necessity brief, and sometimes arguable points are stated without argument, but for the most part the lines followed are those which have won general acceptance with competent present-day scholarship.

For the present chapter and the one following the four Gospels are of course the outstanding sources. The

evaluation and appropriation of their materials has been and is the main task of him who would set the figure of Jesus of Nazareth in the clearest possible light of history. We have seen that the materials are diverse, both in origin and character. It may be well to recall here what was said in Chapter V as to the stages which can be detected in the handing down of the Christian tradition about what the Founder of the Faith had done and said. There was, first, the oral testimony of eye-witnesses; second, brief and fragmentary written narratives, the "sayings" element being particularly prominent; third, a more extended and inclusive narrative following a chronological outline (Mark); fourth, still more ambitious narratives, including additional matter and written from special points of view (Matthew, Luke). To these we may add, fifth, a new presentation of the Life, in the light of Paul's teachings and of a broader outlook —less distinctively Jewish, more philosophical and mystical—than that of the earlier accounts (John; cf. the outline near the beginning of Chap. IV). Each of these, after the first, is dependent on those which precede, though in the case of the last (*i.e.* the Fourth Gospel) the dependence is not very obvious. The greatest historical value naturally attaches to material belonging to the first and second stages, and, since such material in original form is not available, to those Gospels and portions of Gospels which stand closest to them. To be more explicit, in a historical study of the life of Jesus greatest dependence will be placed on such matter in Mark, and in the non-Markan parts of Matthew and Luke, as seems to trained investigators to have back of it either the direct testimony of persons who were present or the evidence of early documents. Other matter, whether in the Synoptics or the Fourth Gospel, or elsewhere, will be tested as to its conformity with this, which does not at all mean that it will necessarily be deemed valueless.

Outside the four Gospels the most important witness is Paul. It is doubtful if Paul had any contact with Jesus during his lifetime; certainly there was between them no intimacy. And of the earthly Jesus Paul, in his letters, has comparatively little to say. Part of what he has to say, moreover, does not serve as direct source material for history. When he states, for example, that Jesus "knew no sin" (2 Cor. 5:21) we may believe that the statement is wholly true, but we must at the same time recognize that Paul cannot possibly have had such knowledge of Jesus' sinlessness as scientific history requires. His statements about matters of this character can have historical value only as showing what such a Christian as Paul—of the first generation of Christians—believed (cf. Phil. 2:5-11; 2 Cor. 8:9; Rom. 1:3-4; 5:19). More directly pertinent are his quotations of, or allusions to, sayings of Jesus (see *e.g.* 1 Thess. 4:15; 1 Cor. 7:10; 9:14; 11:23-25; cf. Acts 20:35); his frequent references to the crucifixion (see 1 Cor. 1:23; 2:2; 2 Cor. 13:4; Gal. 3:1; etc.); and the fact, which comes out incidentally here and there, that he was personally acquainted with one of Jesus' brothers, James, and on several occasions came into close contact with Peter, who had been one of Jesus' intimate friends and followers (see Gal. 1:19; 2:9; 1:18; 2:11ff.; 1 Cor. 9:5).

When all is summed up the amount of data which Paul gives us about the life of Jesus is small. If it is thought of merely as supplementing the Gospels, in matters of detail, its value is not great. The importance of Paul's testimony lies rather in the fact that it puts the life of Jesus on a solid basis of historicity. No other sources have as great value in this respect. About the origin, date, and authorship of the Gospels there is, and probably always will be, a good deal of obscurity. It is therefore a matter of great satisfaction to the historical student to be able to check up their narrative by reference to let-

ters, the genuineness of which is scarcely questioned, written but little more than a score of years after the death of him of whom the Gospels tell. Paul certainly does not verify the Gospels at every point, but in his letters scientific history finds a sufficient answer to any suspicion that the great figure of the Gospels may have been, after all, but a creation of faith.

Outside the Gospels and Paul (and Acts 20:35) there is almost no source material for the life of Jesus of historical value in the New Testament. There are scattered references here and there, but they are mostly vague and theological in character. Where definite events in Jesus' life are referred to (as in 1 Tim. 6:13; 2 Pet. 1:16-18; Heb. 2:18; 4:15; 5:7; 13:12) we cannot in any case feel confident that the reference has back of it any independent information as to the facts. It seems to be merely the tradition which we have in the Synoptic Gospels which is reproduced.

Of early references to Jesus outside the New Testament only two require mention here. The Roman historian Tacitus, writing about 115 A. D., refers to Christ, the founder of the abhorred group called Christians, as having been put to death by the procurator Pontius Pilate in the reign of Tiberias (*Annals* 15:44). The Jewish historian Josephus speaks of the condemnation of "James, the brother of Jesus, the so-called Christ" (*Ant.* 20:9:1; date about 93 A. D.). In an earlier passage in the same work (18:3:3) Josephus apparently had something to say about the death of Jesus himself. But the passage was altered by early Christians so as to make it more favorable to their cause, and the original reading became lost. These references of Tacitus and Josephus have the same sort of value as those of Paul, that is, as placing the historicity of Jesus on firmer ground. They are later than Paul's, but they gain weight from the fact that the

men who wrote them were not propagators, but rather enemies of Christianity.

There is one extra-canonical gospel, called the Gospel of the Hebrews, for which the claim has been made that it is equal in value to the Gospel according to John, but only brief fragments of it are extant and they scarcely bear out the claim (see Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus,* 46ff.). Of the Oxyrhynchus "Sayings of Jesus" (discovered in 1897 and 1903), again it must be said that their significance is less great than some who have read about them have been led to suppose. "Most of these utterances," as Professor Kent remarks, "seem but the reverberating echoes of the sayings which the canonical gospels present in their more nearly original form" (*Life of Jesus,* 6).

Such are the sources. If we wish to go beyond the mere facts that Jesus lived in Palestine, died a criminal's death, and left behind him a sect of followers, we must look to the four Gospels for almost all our materials. And that is to say that we must content ourselves with second-hand materials. We have nothing written by Jesus himself, and nothing, apparently, which comes directly from the pen of an intimate associate. Paul, thanks to his letters and the first-hand record of Acts, we may know intimately, and feel that we know with a good deal of certainty. To know Jesus—the historical Jesus of Nazareth—with the same intimacy and certainty is, to say the least, vastly more difficult. The Gospels present varying pictures, which at some points are hard to reconcile. From the first the church's faith and practice included elements not derived particularly from the Founder's life and teachings, but rather inherited from Judaism or absorbed from some other source in the environment. This was inevitable, and not necessarily regrettable. And it was equally inevitable, no doubt, that when the church began to produce written accounts

of the Founder's life and work those accounts should reflect, in varying degrees, the faith and practices of the Christian communities from which they sprang. That the Gospels contain such reflections all competent students agree. The task of scholarship has been to sift their materials so that we may see Jesus not only as the church saw him one or more generations after his earthly life had ended, but also, in so far as that is possible, as he was seen by his neighbors in Galilee. To say that the task has been accomplished is doubtless to say too much, but much clarifying work has been done. It is not pure presumption to feel that one knows—with the knowledge with which scientific history has to do—what manner of person Jesus was, what his dominant ideals were.

B. Birth, Ancestry, Paternity.

No information as to the birth, childhood, and early life of Jesus is given in Mark, in the non-Markan matter common to Matthew and Luke, or in John. We are dependent on matter contained in the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke. These two accounts, however, differ radically from each other and present difficulties of various sorts. In Matthew we read of Jesus being born in Bethlehem and of Magi from the East paying homage to him. They find him in a house, which, we infer, is where his mother Mary and her husband Joseph had their home. But through the visit of the Magi the jealous suspicions of King Herod are aroused, and a hasty journey into Egypt is necessary to save the child. Only after the death of Herod does the family venture to return to the homeland, and then, learning that Herod has been succeeded by his son Archelaus in Judaea, they do not go back to Bethlehem but proceed northward into Galilee and take up their residence in Nazareth. At the next reference to Jesus his childhood and youth are past and he is ready to begin his active work. Such is

Matthew's account: we turn to Luke. Here also the birth occurs in Bethlehem, but the circumstances related are very different. Joseph and Mary have *come from* Nazareth, "their own city," a specific errand (the census) bringing them to Bethlehem. The inn is full, and no house, apparently, is open to the expectant mother: it is a manger that receives the child when he is born. There is no mention of Magi, but shepherds in the neighborhood see a vision of angels and are told of the birth of the Christ. He is circumcised the eighth day, according to the Hebrew Law, and certain temple rites, required by the Law to be observed forty days or more after the birth of a male child, are also attended to. This is done the more easily since Bethlehem is near to Jerusalem. Then, "when they had accomplished all things that were according to the law of the Lord," they return to their home in Nazareth. Luke devotes a couple of additional verses to statements, in general terms, about Jesus' growth and development, and eleven verses to a story of a visit to Jerusalem at the age of twelve; then he too launches into the account of the active public life.

There is no explicit contradiction in these two accounts, unless it be with respect to the flight to Egypt and residence there To fit this into Luke's account is difficult, if not impossible. Other differences may be reconciled with more or less plausibility. When we read the two narratives, however, and take into account the complete silence of the other Gospels and of early Christian literature in general, it is clear that a generation or two after Jesus' life had ended very little authentic information as to his early life had survived. The author of Matthew knew of one group of traditions and worked them into his narrative. Luke's inquiries brought to light another group, and he made use of them. To assume that they have no historical value is quite unjustified, but to be

certain as to just what is, in each case, the nucleus of fact is not possible.

Two points it will perhaps be worth while to discuss in a little detail, not so much by reason of their inherent importance as because of the light which a discussion of them may throw on the character of the source materials with which we have to do. They are (1) the question of Jesus' descent from King David, and (2) the question of his paternity.

The title Son of David is applied to Jesus a dozen or more times in the Synoptic Gospels. Paul also refers to him as of "the seed of David," and in Revelation his Davidic descent is several times affirmed. Both Matthew and Luke, in their opening chapters, give genealogical lists in which the descent from David (and farther back) is traced. In short, the idea pervades a large part of the New Testament. Yet there is evidence of a different sort which must also be included in the reckoning. For one thing, the two genealogies upon examination prove to conflict with each other hopelessly. Matthew traces the descent through Solomon and the whole line of the kings of Judah, Luke through Nathan—a son of David who is otherwise quite unknown. Thus for some fourteen generations in Matthew's list, and twenty in Luke's, the two lines diverge. Then they are connected by a single common name, that of Shealtiel, only to diverge again and remain apart until the name of Joseph, husband of Mary, is reached. Both pedigrees cannot be correct. Matthew's is highly artificial, leaving out the names of such prominent kings as Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah, the inclusion of which would have spoiled the scheme by which the entire list is summed up in three series of fourteens (1:17). Hence if we wish to assume that one is correct Luke's is probably the one that we should take. But the matter is further complicated by the passages Mark 12:35-37 (cf. Matt. 22:41-46; Luke 20:41-44) and John

7:41-42. In the former passage Jesus himself seems to argue against the view of the rabbis that the Messiah must be David's son; in the latter the question, "Hath not the Scripture said that the Christ cometh of the seed of David, and from Bethlehem, the village where David was?"—put as an objection to Jesus' claims—is quoted without any suggestion on the author's part that it had a simple answer in the fact that he had been born in Bethlehem and was of Davidic descent, notwithstanding his later residence in Galilee. In fact the Fourth Gospel throughout is conspicuously silent about Jesus being a descendent of David. If the author knew of the tradition, as seems probable, it is a fair conjecture that he believed it to be a mistake.

It was widely expected that the Messiah would be of David's line, and it may be that this expectation was the sole ground for the later belief that Jesus was a descendent of the great Hebrew king. There is the same possibility, also, with respect to the stories of the birth in Bethlehem. The town had been David's home, and for this reason it had a prominent place in Jewish messianic hopes (see Mic. 5:2; Matt. 2:4-6). But it was as Jesus of Nazareth, not Jesus of Bethlehem, that the Founder of Christianity became known, and those who regard the Bethlehem stories as poetic legends rather than history assume that Nazareth was probably the actual place of his birth. The evidence on the whole matter is fragmentary and conflicting, and a final decision is not possible.

We turn now to the problem of the paternity, which in some of its aspects is a good deal similar to that of the descent and place of birth. References to Jesus as born of a virgin are very much less frequent, however, than references to him as David's son. Indeed it is only in the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke—mainly of Matthew—that such references are found at all. The

passage in Matthew is brief (1:18-25), but explicit and unambiguous. Mary is the mother of Jesus but Joseph is not his father: it is through the Holy Spirit that he has been conceived. This is the one theme of the passage, so that if interpolation is suspected what has been interpolated would have to be the passage as a whole. In Luke, on the other hand, the case is different. If two phrases—"seeing I know not a man," in 1:34 [1] and "as was supposed," in 3:23—be considered as not belonging to the original narrative, there is no suggestion in this Gospel of Jesus' paternity having been other than natural. But it should be understood that the position of these phrases in our most reliable manuscripts is secure: if suspicions regarding them are to be taken seriously it must be on other than textual grounds. What some of these grounds are we shall briefly indicate.

It is perhaps noteworthy that Luke, in the chapter following that which has the references to the supernatural paternity, speaks repeatedly of Joseph as the father, and Joseph and Mary as the parents, of Jesus; also that in both Matthew's and Luke's genealogies it is through Joseph, not Mary, that the pedigree is traced. But too much is not to be made of such evidence. It may fairly be argued that the language in the one case represents the popular, and in the other the legal, point of view. The Fourth Gospel, as in the matter of Davidic ancestry, is completely silent, and, in this case as in that, there is at least one passage in which the silence seems significant. Jesus' opponents say (in 6:42): "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How doth he now say, I am come down out of heaven?" Supernatural birth would seem to provide a

[1] Perhaps a rather better case can be made out for regarding 1:34-35 as an interpolation rather than merely the one phrase in verse 34. It can be argued with considerable plausibility that these two verses can be removed "not only without impairing, but actually with the result of improving the context." (See Moffat, *Int.* 268-69.)

simple answer to this challenge, but there is no hint of such an answer either here or elsewhere in the book. In 1:45 it is "Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph," whom Philip tells Nathaniel he has found.

The silence of the earlier gospel sources, Mark and the common matter of Matthew- Luke, is even more significant, as is also the silence of Paul. In Paul and Mark, indeed, there are references which seem to many careful students of the question to be inconsistent with the tradition of supernatural birth. Paul speaks of God sending His Son "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (Rom. 8:3), and of Jesus being "born of the seed of David according to the flesh," and designated as God's Son not through supernatural birth but by his resurrection from the dead (Rom. 1:3-4). Mark tells of Jesus' mother and brothers, in later years when his public career was at its height, attempting to interrupt his work, apparently thinking that he had become mentally unbalanced through his religious ecstasy (3:31ff.; cf, verse 21). Can such an attitude be reconciled with the accounts of supernatural announcements and portents heralding his birth?

But if the birth stories are not based on fact, how is their origin to be accounted for? We cannot conjecture in this case—as in the case of descent from David—that Jewish expectation about the Messiah may have been transformed into Christian belief about Jesus. That the Messiah would be supernaturally conceived by an unmarried mother was, as far as we know, no part of the hope of any Jew. Nevertheless it is not hard to imagine how such a belief about Jesus may have arisen, apart from any basis in known fact. In the ancient world the "flesh" was widely regarded as inherently sinful, and, more specifically, there was a widespread belief that contamination resulted from the ordinary physical process of conception and birth. There was also the natural tendency to assume divine paternity in the case of men whose

deeds seemed to lift them far above the plane of ordinary mortals (cf. above, under Emperor-Worship, Chap. XV). With such a background of thought it is not surprising to find frequent expression in ancient literature of the idea of supernatural influence having been manifested in the conception and birth of extraordinary men. Philo, writing at about the time the Gospels were taking shape, expresses the belief that every child of promise was born miraculously. He thinks of Isaac and Samuel, though they had human fathers, as really begotten through divine seed. The real husband of Leah is "the Unnoticed." And so with other outstanding characters of Israel's history. (*Works,* Yonge Ed., I, 166, 186, 273, 344.) In India, Buddha and Vardhamana were said not to have had earthly fathers, and similar beliefs in the case of Oriental monarchs and Greek and Roman heroes are well known. The Mediterranean world of the first century was fruitful soil for the rise and growth of such conceptions, and it is not incredible that the birth stories of the Gospels may have had such origin.

The early church was profoundly convinced, as the church ever since has been, of the divinity of its Lord. But early Christians held fast also—though not without difficulty—to the fact that their Lord had been a character in history, had lived a human life. What, then, was the relation—the time relation—between these two items in the church's history and faith? *When* had Jesus of Nazareth become, in the full sense, Christ, Lord, Savior, unique Son of God? The question was not one which would greatly concern the average man, but to speculative minds it could not but present itself. The final answer is familiar to us. Jesus' preëxistence was affirmed, and the beginning of his Lordship was thrown back into eternity. This conclusion was reached early. We find it stated not only in the Fourth Gospel (*e.g.* 1:1-14; 3:31-32; 6:33-35; 8:58), but also in the later

letters of Paul (*e.g.* Col. 1:15-17; Phil. 2:5-8). Yet it was not reached at a single step, as the New Testament clearly shows. Acts 2:32-36 points to Jesus' resurrection and ascension as marking his first induction into the fulness of his great office (cf. Rom. 1:3-4, cited above). Mark 1:9-11 points to the baptism. Finally, in the birth stories—apparently representing a later stage of the development—we have the significant moment thrown still farther back: through the very manner of his conception in his mother's womb Jesus had assumed divinity and had entered upon his office as the Lord and Savior of men. Later this idea was easily fused with that of preëxistence: the supernatural birth come to mark not the beginning of the divine life and office but the medium of its transfer from the heavenly to the earthly sphere. But it is worth noting that Paul and the author of the Fourth Gospel, the great propounders of the preëxistence doctrine in the New Testament, seem to feel no need of a virgin birth.

This brief survey has covered the most important points. What the exact facts were as to Jesus' ancestry and paternity, and the circumstances attending his birth, we shall doubtless never know. There are still many who look upon the narratives of Matt. 1-2 and Luke 1-2 as completely historical, but this view does not represent the trend of present-day scholarship. On the contrary the weight of competent opinion favors regarding them as legendary, though containing nuclei of fact. To so regard them, it should be realized, is not to think of them as deliberate inventions or as valueless. "Legends are not born as stories are born, invented with the full consciousness of the inventor. They are born as dreams are born, of an inner urge through which rise up pell-mell all the subconscious elements that stir in the depths of our being. Thus they are not falsehoods, or the work of falsehood, but truths deeper than historical truth"

(Berguer, *Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus,* 126). These birth legends gave expression to the conviction that Jesus had come from God. It was a universal conviction in the early Church, but the ways of expressing it, as we have seen, were various. The greatest of the Church's leaders reached and expressed the truth underlying the legends in other ways. It is not surprising that many modern Christian leaders have done the same. As yet they have been followed in this by only a minority of the body of Christians, but it is apparently an increasing minority, and it includes many who testify that the changed view has not meant for them loss but gain.

One's view on such a subject as this will not, and should not, be based entirely on the New Testament evidence. Other considerations—one's general view of the universe, one's definition of religion, one's theory of inspiration, one's conception of what the significance of Jesus for humanity was and is—will inevitably and properly enter in. And so long as the outlook of Christian people on these matters differs as widely as it does now we cannot expect all to agree about such a question as that of the virgin birth. But it would seem that we might agree to disagree. It may reasonably be expected of the intelligent Christian that he should try to have some real understanding of the question, that he should refrain from taking a hostile and obstructive attitude toward scholarly investigation, and that he should cultivate the Christian virtues of trust and tolerance.

C. Childhood and Early Life.

Reference has already been made to the account, in Luke 2:41-51, of a visit to Jerusalem with his parents when Jesus was twelve years old. It belongs to the same block of material as Luke's infancy stories, and questions as to its historicity have naturally been raised. But it has passed through the ordeal of criticism very suc-

cessfully. We have no knowledge as to where Luke got the story, and we recognize that when he got it a half-century or so must have elapsed since the event. But we also see clearly that its picture of Jesus is consistent with what the earliest sources tell us of him and that the incident which it narrates is in harmony with what we know of adolescent psychology.

It may be thought of as, in a sense, a conversion incident. Jesus was at about the age of puberty, which is earlier in Oriental countries than with us. And psychological investigations have shown that this period is likely to be marked not only by important physical changes but by mental and religious crises as well. Up to this time there has been a lack of fixity, or focus, in the child's conscious life. A variety of instincts and impulses, more or less modified and repressed by pressure from without, have ruled the self in a haphazard way. But the time comes when a greater unity must be achieved. The self must become more consciously defined; it must determine, in a measure at least, what forces are going to dominate it, what direction it is going to take. If the forces which gain ascendency at this time are altruistic, spiritual, religious, then what we call conversion results. But the experience is not necessarily felt as sudden or spectacular. The new outlook may not appear to be new to him who has gained it. Rather, it may be so clear and self-evident, so obviously and joyously true, as to seem like an old possession now for the first time fully realized.

Such would seem to have been preëminently the case with Jesus. "Did you not know," he said to his parents, "that I must be in my Father's house?" To him it was so clear and vivid—this sense of God as Father and of that fatherhood as a fact of deep personal significance to him! It was a shock—a disappointment at least—to have the realization brought home to him that even his

parents could not enter with him into the fulness of his great discovery. It was a new discovery, very likely, in the sense that now for the first time it came to the forefront of his consciousness, dwarfing all else, yet it seemed, and was, old: something which had always been a part of him.

When Jesus, at the age of twelve, called God "my Father" we need not surmise that he was merely using a phrase which he had heard others use. It was his own, nor is there reason for supposing that a struggle with perverse instincts and passions had been necessary before he could use it thus naturally. Struggle there was later, over the question of how he was to make contact with the outside world, but not, we gather, at this time. We have to picture his "conversion" not as a triumphant victory but rather as a calm and joyous synthesis. To so picture it is not to minimize its significance. Where, indeed, shall we find a more significant moment in history than the moment in which the words "my Father" first came not from the lips only but from the soul of Jesus of Nazareth?

Of Jesus' life between infancy and the age of thirty only this one incident has come down to us. (Stories found in the apocryphal gospels must be disregarded, as they do not bear the marks of authenticity.) The twelve years before the temple incident are covered by Luke with the simple statement that "the child grew up and became strong and thoughtful, with God's blessing resting on him" (Luke 2:40; Goodspeed's translation). With equal brevity the eighteen years following are summed up in the statement that "As Jesus grew older he gained in wisdom and won the approval of God and men" (2:52; *ibid.*). There is not much information here. Other lines of evidence, however, not unimportant, though indirect—are open to us. We are able to know something of the family to which Jesus belonged, the

occupation which he followed, the neighborhood in which he lived, and the education which it is likely he received. We may also gain hints as to his early life from his later teachings, particularly the parables.

As to the family, we read of four brothers: James, Joseph, Judas, and Simon, and of sisters (Mark 6:3; Matt. 13:55-56). The sisters are not named nor are we told how many there were. The mother, Mary, was still living during the time of Jesus' public activities (Mark 3:31). Indeed, according to the Fourth Gospel she survived Jesus himself (John 19:25-27). But the father, Joseph, seems to have died before Jesus public life began. This is probably a safe inference from the fact that when the mother and brothers are referred to there is no mention of him. The family, then, consisted of at least eight members, and if the birth legends are right in representing Jesus as the oldest son it is likely that the chief support of the family, for a period of years, devolved upon him. No doubt one or more of his brothers were old enough to assume this responsibility by the time when he began his public work.

In Mark 6:3 Jesus is spoken of as an artisan or mechanic. The word used is one which might be applied to a skilled worker in wood, stone, or metal, but it seems to have most often been used of a carpenter. In Matthew this reference to "the carpenter" has been changed to read "the carpenter's son" (Matt. 13:55). It seemed not quite fitting to this author, evidently, that Jesus the Messiah should be called a carpenter. Presumably he had some information—knew of a tradition at least—according to which Joseph had been an artisan. Our knowledge on the subject is limited to what we get from these two references.

With regard to the neighborhood in which Jesus lived it is noteworthy that Galilee, the northern part of Palestine, differed markedly from Judaea, the southern part.

It was, and is to-day, much more fertile and productive, and in Jesus' time it was penetrated by great highways as Judaea was not, and hence was in much closer and more constant contact with the outside world. The situation of Nazareth among the hills made it a little secluded, yet great trade routes passed near by and there were flourishing Greek cities not far away. Sepphoris, indeed, lay only a few miles distant. Nazareth must have been almost a suburb of this city, which Herod Antipas rebuilt and made, as Josephus says, "the ornament of all Galilee" (*Ant.* 18:2:1).

Such was the locality in which the life of Jesus before the beginning of his public activities—which is to say all but a comparatively small part of his life—was spent. The setting was conducive to reflection and communion with nature, yet it was not remote from the world of men and affairs.

Jesus no doubt attended the school attached to the synagogue in Nazareth. There he would learn to read and probably also to write. In school and at home he would learn to feed his mind and soul with the varied treasures which the Jewish Scriptures contained—legends, songs, laws, moral precepts, historical annals, and prophetic utterances. Beyond this point, we must assume, his education did not go. It seems highly probable that long before his active work began thoughts of a religious mission to his people had been in his mind, but if so he did not prepare for that mission by enrolling as a pupil of one of the famous rabbis of the day. And the reason—one reason at least—is not far to seek. The routine of scribal training would not have appealed to him. It was the role of the independent prophet rather than of the institutionary scribe which he had in view.

In so far as Hellenistic culture influenced him it must have been only in very general ways. It is likely that he spoke and understood Greek somewhat, as there was

no doubt much occasion for its use in Galilee. But that he read Greek literature is improbable. There is scarcely a hint of specifically Greek ideas in the record of his later teachings which the Synoptic Gospels have handed down to us. The background of his thought as there revealed is Jewish through and through. Nevertheless the fact that during the formative period of his life the tides of Hellenistic civilization flowed almost past his door is not to be ignored. It may at any rate help to account for his throwing off so markedly the typical Jewish narrowness of outlook—for the striking way in which his teachings have proved to transcend the bounds both of race and of time.

On the whole it would seem that the factors in his early environment which contributed most toward preparing Jesus for his later work were three: the Jewish Scriptures, nature, and the homely life of men, women, and children as he saw it in his little world. Perhaps we should add a fourth: hopes of deliverance and of a glorious future which were current among Jews of his time, especially the apocalyptic type of hope.

Jesus' familiarity with the Scriptures, and the influence which they exerted on his thought and life, are among the most obvious things which the Gospels reveal. It is clear that though he never acquired the scribal technique of detailed interpretation his study of the sacred writings was far from being merely casual and perfunctory. The record of his acts, as well as his teachings, shows how deeply ideas from such books as Psalms, Isaiah, and Deuteronomy had entered into the fabric of his soul.

How the influence of nature and of the homely life about him is revealed in his parables has often been pointed out (see *e.g.* Glover, *The Jesus of History,* 26ff.). He illustrates his thought by reference to eagles, sparrows, doves, foxes, lilies, grain. His later fondness for

going off to a quiet place in the hills to pray was no doubt but the continuance of a habit of his youth. We note his references to leaven and to bread, to the hand mills at which the women ground the grain, to the ovens in which the bread was baked, to eggs and fish, to patched clothes, to children sleeping in the same bed with the father, to the sweeping of floors, to candles and bushels, to games and oaths, to the liking of the scribes for the deferential title "Rabbi." In all this we see closeness to nature; an absorbing interest in people, especially in the rank and file; an acute and observant mind; a keen and balanced judgment; and, back of it all and pervading it all, an exceptional sense of the reality and nearness of God. This and much else Jesus was making a part of his equipment long before he began his public work. The "silent years" are not entirely silent after all.

We may close the chapter with a word about the influence on him, at this period, of the apocalyptic type of future hope. We have seen that Jewish religious thought in Jesus' time had at some points advanced beyond the Old Testament (cf. above Chap. XIII). The outlook toward the future, in particular, had been affected by the progress of events. Many, probably the majority, still could think of a great future deliverance only in terms of national victory and a glorified kingdom of Israel. But by the more calm and thoughtful minority the realization of such a hope must have been seen to be impracticable, and by some, further, it would be seen to fall short of the true ideal. Since the Exile Jewish thought, in some circles, had been broadened. A philosophy of history was being developed, and theories as to what the future had in store were being constructed on broader lines, embracing the whole world of men and nature in their scope. These theories had features which are likely to seem fantastic to us. The sudden and visible collapse of the present order with the ushering in of

a new order direct from heaven and God, the emptying of the graves and the Judgment Day—all this shows an outlook toward the future radically different from that of the modern man. But this should not blind us to the fact that in the apocalyptic type of thought we have religious faith courageously facing reality. It was at once the most progressive and the most serious thought of Jesus' countrymen in his time. How much he read of its non-canonical literature we do not know. Perhaps a good deal, though he does not show its influence directly, as he does of several books of the Old Testament. It may be that its ideas came to him for the most part indirectly, through their being "in the air." At any rate they came to him—in some way. In the next chapter we shall see that it was in apocalyptic garb that he clothed his ideal of the new order which he proclaimed.

CHAPTER XIX

NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY: JESUS—PUBLIC LIFE AND DEATH

A. At the Jordan and in the Desert.

If we judge the incident at Jerusalem at the age of twelve to have marked the first great milestone in Jesus' life, the second was marked by his baptism at the Jordan by John. According to Luke (3:23) his age at this time was "about thirty years." Luke evidently did not know his exact age, nor do we. The only other hint on the subject which the New Testament gives us is in John 8:57. To Jesus' statement that "Abraham rejoiced to see my day" his opponents retort, "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?" If any inference is to be drawn from this it would be that his appearance at this stage of his public career was such as to suggest that Luke's estimate of his age may have been too low.

The scene of John's preaching and baptizing activities was apparently along the lower Jordan, not far from the Dead Sea. It was a desert region, not at all the sort of place to which one would go who wished to preach to multitudes. Such evidently was not John's original wish or plan. In some way—probably through the reading of prophetic literature and observation of the life about him—he had become convinced that the Messiah was coming soon and that his coming would mean drastic judgment upon wrong-doers quite regardless of the supposed privilege of Jewish nationality. The need of the

hour, then, was repentance, in preparation for the dread coming event. It was no doubt his keen sense of this need for himself that drove John to the desert and kept him there leading an ascetic life. But his hermit solitude was invaded. People from the towns and villages came out to look at him (Matt. 11:7; Luke 7:24). He had to warn them as he felt that he himself had been warned. Some gave heed and spread the word abroad, and thus John's work as a preacher of repentance and a herald of a Coming One began.

His preaching made a great impression on the nation. This is clear from Josephus' account of it (*Ant.* 18:116-119) as well as from the New Testament. A powerful personality had appeared among a people who were feeling keenly the need of leadership. Josephus supplements the Gospel narratives of his arrest and execution by stating that Herod Antipas feared his great popularity and wished to guard against a possible revolt. Even more striking is the very different sort of tribute paid to John and his work by Jesus. On this Holtzmann remarks that "once at least Jesus himself pointed, not to his own public appearance, but to the public appearance of the Baptist, as marking the great turning-point in the history of religion (Matt. 11:12f. Luke 16:16)." It is worth noting, further, that a sect of John's followers continued in existence for some time after the launching of the Christian church, and were only gradually absorbed into it (Acts 18:24-19:7).

It is not at all surprising that Jesus should have left his home in Nazareth and gone to John. Much in his own thought and experience must have served to prepare him for the Baptist's proclamation and plea. Perhaps the most unique feature of John's mission and message was that they were concerned—notwithstanding Herod Antipas' suspicions—not so much with the external needs of the Jews as a nation as with the inner needs

of the Jews as individuals. And such was certainly Jesus' point of view. That the real menace was to be seen not in Roman rule but in individual sin; that the real salvation which Israel required was not to be had through the throwing off of a foreign yoke but through men and women getting right with God and living in justice and harmony with their fellow-men: this conviction, revealed in Jesus' later teachings, we must judge to have been impressed upon him through long years of thought, observation, and experience. Only thus could it have been expressed as he expressed it, with the note of originality and authority. How his heart must have leaped, then, at the news that down by the Jordan a prophet with the power of a second Elijah was stirring multitudes with the proclamation of this truth.

Nor need the fact of Jesus submitting to baptism by John be thought hard to understand. It is extremely unlikely that the question of whether he was guilty of sin, and so in need of a "baptism of repentance," entered Jesus' mind in this connection at all. It is indeed true, and noteworthy, that we have no evidence of Jesus having had a deep sense of personal sin, or having felt, as John did, the need of preparing for judgment on his own account. We must suppose that his sense of Israel's sin had been arrived at less by introspection and more by observation than had been the case with John, but it was not less keen on that account. Repentance, he too felt, was the great and immediate need of his countrymen. He approved of John's work and wished to identify himself with the great prophetic movement thus begun. In being baptized by John he expressed this approval and this desire in the most natural way.

Exactly what significance the baptism ceremony had, in the thought of John himself and of his converts, we do not know. Ceremonial washings were a familiar part of Jewish ritual, yet John's practice in the matter was

unusual and served to attract special attention, as the mere fact of his being called "John *the Baptist*" shows (see Matt. 3:1; Josephus, *Ant.*, 18:116). It is possible that the baptizing part of John's work was suggested to him not so much by the laws relating to ceremonial purification (*e.g.* Lev. 15; Num. 19:18-19) as by such a passage as Ezek. 36:25ff.: "And I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you. . . . Then shall ye remember your evil ways, and your doings that were not good; and ye shall loathe yourselves in your own sight for your iniquities and your abominations." Thus Jehovah is made to speak to the people of Israel. It was this sort of cleansing, certainly, that both John and Jesus coveted for their countrymen.

Whatever significance may have been attached to the ceremony in general, in the case of Jesus it was destined to have a profound and far-reaching significance. Mark relates that as he came out of the water "he saw the heavens rent asunder, and the Spirit as a dove descending upon him: and a voice came out of the heavens, Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased" (1:10-11). It is likely that Mark understood the rending of the heavens and the descent of the dove in a literal and objective sense, but to most modern readers it will be more natural to think of what occurred as a vision or a spiritual experience of some sort. In any case it was an impressive experience. Already at the age of twelve we have found him with a deep sense of God's fatherhood and of himself as a child of God, but the full realization of what this was to mean to him—of how sonship so profoundly felt was to express itself—this came first, we gather, and came suddenly, at the time of his baptism by John. It was then, in short, that he received his "call." Such is the

clear impression which Mark conveys. He brings Jesus on the scene first in connection with the baptism, then, after referring in a couple of sentences to the temptation experience, has him launching his preaching mission in Galilee.

Did Jesus become conscious, in connection with his baptism, of being himself the Coming One whom John proclaimed, the Messiah of Jewish hopes? We cannot say with certainty. It was not until a good deal later, as we shall see, that he revealed such a consciousness to others, even to his closest friends. Yet the meager data which have come down to us about the baptism experience suggest that it probably did have for him that significance. In a passage in Isaiah (11:2) the prophet says of the great deliverer whom he expects that "the spirit of Jehovah shall rest upon him." In the Second Psalm, again, Jehovah addresses the Messianic king as "my son." It is likely, then, that both his sense of the divine spirit possessing him and his hearing of the voice would point, in the thought of Jesus, in the direction of Messiahship. No doubt his contact with John had made the question of his own mission—of the contribution which he was to make to the need of his countrymen and of humanity—a burning question, one which could no longer be repressed. And in this vision, as he emerged from the Jordan, he may have felt that the answer had come to him.

That spiritual wrestlings such as those described in the temptation narratives should have followed upon the experience at the Jordan was entirely natural. Paul tells us that after the great experience which meant for him a call to be a preacher of Christ he "went away into Arabia" (Gal. 1:17). This constraint to retire for a time when confronted by a stupendous task has been often felt. Matthew and Luke have parallel accounts of Jesus' struggles at this period—accounts which must have come

originally from Jesus' own lips and which preserve the pictorial language which he used so naturally and so effectively. They tell of three suggested courses of action, all of them rejected by Jesus as involving false and unworthy conceptions of the mission to which he was called.

The interpretation of the first temptation—to turn stones into bread—is more difficult than is the case with the other two. On the surface it may appear to be merely the suggestion, called forth by hunger, that he put to a practical test the Messianic power which he had come to feel was his. The rejection of the suggestion, then, would be due to Jesus' seeing that it involved an unworthy doubt. But it is probable that the struggle here suggested was farther-reaching than that. In these days of reaction following the spiritual heights reached when with John, the thought of Jesus may well have dwelt much on his utter lack of material resources, of all that goes to make up what men call power. How could he, who had not even bread with which to satisfy his hunger, hope to carry through the role which his vision had shown to him? The thought of strengthening his own position in this respect as a preliminary to his vocation may well have occurred to him. Something of the sort is suggested by his use of Deut. 8:3: "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Material things, after all, were not vital: his mission was in no way dependent upon them.

The other two temptations are related in character to the first, but it is easier to see the specific direction in which each points. To launch a Messiahship of the magical, wonder-working type would be the most promising way of securing a great popular following. It was this, we may assume, that the temptation to cast himself from the pinnacle of the temple involved. Again,

there was the possibility of using the world's own method in carrying through his mission to and for the world—the method of policy and compromise, certain to involve, also, intrigue and violence, the method which another prophet, Mohammed, afterward used with much success of a kind. "All these things will I give thee," said Satan, "if thou wilt fall down and worship me." Said Jesus, again quoting Deuteronomy (6:13): "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." No doubt worshiping and serving God might mean to different people very different things, but what it meant to Jesus was such that he could not establish his kingdom after the typical manner of men. He left his desert retreat and—John having meanwhile been imprisoned by Herod Antipas—went northward to begin a preaching mission of his own, in humble fashion, in his native Galilee.

B. Public Career in Galilee.

He established headquarters in Capernaum, perhaps in the home of friends or relatives. The town was a flourishing commercial center, so situated as to give ready access both to other points on the lake (the Sea of Galilee) and to towns and villages in the hinterland. Here, then, in Capernaum and a surrounding district scarcely larger than an average county in the United States, nearly all of the brief public work of Jesus was done. As to how long it lasted we are not informed. Not more than one to two years, we must judge from the Synoptic narrative. It is true that the Fourth Gospel suggests a longer period, some two to three years, and also locates Jesus' activities to a considerable extent in Judaea instead of Galilee. In an earlier chapter we took note of these and other differences in the Synoptic and Johannine presentations of Jesus' life. They are seemingly irreconcilable differences. Efforts to harmonize the two on

points such as those with which we are now concerned have been largely given up. And since the Synoptics, in such matters, have much the better claim to trustworthiness, we can scarcely choose but follow them.

Mark tells us that Jesus began his mission in Galilee by proclaiming that "The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand," and by calling upon his hearers to repent. This is strongly reminiscent of the preaching of John. But if, at this point, we get the impression that Jesus is merely a disciple of John, the impression is changed as we proceed with the narrative. Despite what the two have in common, marked differences of outlook and method reveal themselves. In listing the most prominent of these differences, and commenting on them, we shall have gone far toward describing the outstanding features of Jesus' public life and work.

To begin with, we find Jesus less concerned with the externals of religion than John was. He did not live the ascetic life. He did not baptize. The freedom from the observance of fasts and formal prayers which he allowed to himself and his disciples caused comment, the more so since John's disciples were adhering to the Pharisaic custom in this respect (Mark 2:18; Luke 5:33). John had seen clearly that acceptance with God was not guaranteed, in mechanical fashion, by Jewish nationality. He declared that "God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." But Jesus went much farther than John had gone in the direction of stripping both religion and ethics of externalities.

Again, Jesus' outlook had in it more of *joy*. According to Mark (1:15) he declared from the first that his proclamation of a coming kingdom was a "gospel," that is, "good news." The dominant tenor of John's preaching had been stern. He warned his hearers that "even now the axe lieth at the root of the trees: every tree therefore that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down

and cast into the fire." The Mightier One who was to follow him, he declared, would "baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his threshing-floor; and he will gather his wheat into the garner, but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire" (Matt. 3:10, 12). It would not be correct to say that in the words and work of Jesus these expectations of John as to the Messiah's program failed entirely to be realized. In his preaching, as well as in that of his forerunner, the note of sternness was often heard. He too sounded warnings of judgment to come. Yet the passage from the Prophets which he chose to read in the synagogue at Nazareth, as reported by Luke (4:16ff.), is significant. It was one of the "Servant" passages in the latter part of Isaiah: "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor: He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord" (Is. 61:1-2). Thus Jesus read, and followed the reading with the declaration that "To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears." Such a passage evidently appealed to him as voicing his own thought about his mission. He was not blind to the dark side of life; on the contrary he was extremely sensitive to it. Yet his reaction was not that of the pessimist. The dark could and would be made light, sorrow be turned into joy. And it was with just this transformation, in men and in life, that his mission had to do.

The passage just quoted points also to a third, related contrast: Jesus had more sympathy with humanity. There was clearly a positive as well as a negative reason for his not choosing a hermit life as John had done. His temperament was doubtless such that this life did not appeal to him. But, on the more positive side, he had

to reject it because of his deep interest in and concern for people as such—because of his sympathy. Mark, with his briefly sketched but vivid word-pictures, makes it possible for us to follow him in a typical day's activities. We have the following, for example, in Mark 1:35-39, coming after an account of a strenuous day of teaching and healing in Capernaum: "Early in the morning, long before daylight, he got up and left the house and went off to a lonely spot, and prayed there. And Simon and his companions sought him out and found him, and said to him, 'They are all looking for you!' He said to them, 'Let us go somewhere else, to the neighboring country towns, so that I may preach in them, too, for that is why I came out here.' So he went all through Galilee, preaching in their synagogues and driving out the demons" (Goodspeed's translation). The longing to get away from the crowds—to be alone with nature and nature's God—he must have often felt. But his response here when traced to his retreat is noteworthy. It was not only to pray that he had come out from the city: his fellowmen and their needs were present in his thought and had first place in his plans. We are told repeatedly of his being "moved with compassion" toward crowds or individuals, and there is abundant evidence that it was not an aloof or condescending compassion which he felt. He was not handicaped, as men of sympathetic heart have often been, by inability to make contact with those for whom he felt sympathy. There was about him a natural, spontaneous "humanness" (see Mark 2:15; 3:33-35; 7:24-30; 10:13-16, 21a, 42-45; 12:38-40; etc.).

It is as manifesting this innate sympathy that his work as a healer has lasting significance. What has been called the evidential value of his miracles—*i.e.* their value as proving that he came from God and had God's power—is negligible from the point of view of the modern man. Indeed if looked at in that way the impression which they

make is likely to be unfortunate: they may seem more allied to the achievements of a magician than to the stupendous and beneficient works of God, through nature and through man, which we see about us to-day. The truer way of looking at them has been well expressed by Seeley in *Ecce Homo,* a book about Jesus which made a profound impression on a generation earlier than ours:

> It may sometimes strike us that the time which he devoted to acts of beneficence and the relief of ordinary physical evils might have been given to works more permanently beneficial to the race. . . . The whole amount of good done by such works of charity could not be great, compared with Christ's powers of doing good; and if they were intended, as is often supposed, merely as attestations of his divine mission, a few acts of the kind would have served this purpose as well as many. Yet we may see that they were in fact the great work of his life; his biography may be summed up in the words, 'he went about doing good;' . . . He set the first and greatest example of a life wholly governed and guided by the passion of humanity. (Chap. XVI.)

"John did no miracle," we are told (John 10:41). Jesus' departure from his forerunner's precedent in this respect no doubt points to power, and a consciousness of power, which the latter did not possess; but it is not in this that it is chiefly significant.

We are conscious, again—to come to a final and more inclusive contrast—of an *inherent greatness* in Jesus far transcending anything which the sources enable us to see in John. Both were prophets and spoke with the prophet's conviction of being God's representative. It might have been said of John, as well as of Jesus, that he spoke with authority and not as the scribes. The strenuous independence which we find so characteristic of

Jesus—the vigor (Rooseveltian, we might aptly call it) of his attacks on intrenched interests and on views and practices which had nothing to commend them except that custom sanctioned them—these were not without parallel in the preaching of John (see *e.g.* Mark 3:1-6; 7:1-23; 11:15-18; cf. Matt. 3:7-12.) Yet what Jesus said of John—that he was "much more than a prophet" (Matt. 11:9)—has a larger and fuller application to Jesus himself.

The difference appears, for example, in the handling of ethical questions. When publicans, soldiers, and other classes came to John with the question, "What must we do?" he answered, "Extort no more than that which is appointed you"; "Be content with your wages"; etc. It was sound and useful advice. It was also conventional and commonplace, giving no hint of having come from a mind which had looked deeply into the motives from which human actions spring. Utterly different, vastly more profound (whatever else we may think of it) is such a treatment of problems of conduct as we have in the Sermon on the Mount. Here we have a probing beneath acts to attitudes—beneath murder to anger and contempt, beneath adultery to the lustful thought, beneath violations of oaths to a widely prevalent failure to make speech conform to simple truth and reality.

We must judge, too, that the conception of the coming Kingdom was far more fully thought out by Jesus than by John. The task of the Baptist, as he himself conceived it, was to "prepare the way." It was not for him to think through in detail the question of what sort of a Kingdom it was to be. It was to be from God, and therefore a Kingdom of righteousness. So much was clear. And along with this was the appalling fact that his countrymen were not righteous and hence were not qualified for admission to it. To announce, to exhort, to warn—this was the work which he saw laid out for him, and it

was work which he was able to do. Jesus, on the other hand, was able to do, and did do, more than this. He was not only a prophet and a reformer, but also, in the Greek sense, a philosopher. He seems to have expected, with John, that the new order was coming very soon. He seems to have shared with other thinkers among his countrymen certain apocalyptic expectations about the manner of its coming which would not have been possible had his world-view been that of to-day (cf. above, Chaps. XIII, XVI). But it was not these external aspects of the Kingdom idea but was rather its *content* which loomed largest in his thought. He had a vision of the possibilities of a humanity living its life in harmony with God—a vision of a Utopia, which he worked out in some detail and cast into the best mold which was available. It has come down to us at second hand—distorted more or less, undoubtedly—yet even so the intellectual and spiritual genius which pervades it, the glow of a matchless personality which suffuses it, are inescapable.

To sketch the events of Jesus' public life in Galilee in chronological order is not possible. We have seen that Mark, the primary source of information about these events, connects them in a way that shows little interest in chronology, and that "resolute indifference to anything like completeness" is a characteristic of ancient biography in general (see above, Chaps. V, XVII). We know only that Jesus went about in Capernaum and neighboring cities and towns engaged in proclaiming the Kingdom and in teaching and healing activities; that he spoke sometimes in the synagogues and sometimes in private houses or in the open air; that a band of disciples accompanied him, some of whom were later sent out to carry on similar work in a wider field; and that he attracted great crowds to hear him and to witness what the Gospel writers call his deeds of power (δυνάμεις). With the spirit which animated his work, and the main

features of the work itself, we have dealt in the preceding paragraphs.

C. A Period of Wandering.

In Mark 7:24 we read: "And from thence he arose and went away into the territory of Tyre and Sidon." A second note as to itinerary occurs a few verses farther on: "And again he went out from the territory of Tyre and came through Sidon unto the Sea of Galilee through the midst of the territory of Decapolis" (7:31). This apparently points to a return to the *east* side of the lake, hence not to a resumption of the work in Galilee. In 8:10 an unknown place, Dalmanutha, is named; in 8:22 Bethsaida (presumably Bethsaida Julias); and in 8:27 Caesarea Philippi, near Mt. Hermon and the headwaters of the Jordan. Thus the account would seem to have in view two more or less distinct journeys, the entire period, however, being spent away from the old base at Capernaum and outside the ordinary limits of the land of the Jews. The regions traversed lay to the north and east of Galilee.

As to what it was that interrupted the successful work in Galilee we are left in uncertainty. Neither Mark nor Matthew gives any direct information on the subject, and in the later Gospels the very fact that there was such a period in Jesus' life has been lost to view. Several possibilities suggest themselves: waning popularity; danger of arrest at the instigation of Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee; the hostile pressure of the Pharisees; the need of rest—freedom from the crowds; the feeling that private intercourse with his disciples should occupy more of his time. In so far as the first three of the suggested reasons were operative, or any one of them, the withdrawal was to that extent a matter of compulsion. The last two, on the other hand, would explain it rather as due to choice.

There is no certain evidence that Jesus' popularity was waning at this time, but such may have been the case. Both Matthew and Luke report an occasion on which he "began to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not" (Matt. 11:20-24; cf. Luke 10:13-15). He is said to have declared that the heathen cities of Tyre and Sidon would have heeded more readily than Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum had done. The two Gospel writers have this utterance located at different points. Its actual time and occasion are matters of conjecture. And as attractive a conjecture as any is that it belongs to the time of Jesus' departure from Galilee on the journey which had the territory of Tyre and Sidon as its goal. If this is correct it would at least indicate that his feeling, upon leaving the scene of his labors, was one of disappointment; probably also that he was less popular than he had been earlier. Indeed it could scarcely have been otherwise. His fame with the populace was based largely on his "mighty works," which he himself deprecated and tried to avoid. Doubtless many hoped that he would lead an uprising against the Roman overlords (cf. John 6:15), but it must soon have been seen that any such hope was vain. Waning popularity—decreasing disposition on the part of his countrymen to believe his proclamation and listen sympathetically to the setting forth of his ideals—this may well have been a factor in his decision to withdraw from Galilee.

That he was in danger of arrest and imprisonment is also probable. Herod Antipas had disposed of John, and it was to be expected that his successor would meet a similar fate (cf. Matt. 14:13; Luke 13:31). It was a time of unrest, and in Galilee the spirit of revolt was easily aroused. Jesus, for a time at least, was followed by great crowds, a fact which in itself was sufficient to make the authorities suspicious of his activities.

Mark tells of several verbal encounters between Jesus and the scribes and Pharisees during the Galilean period, and it is noteworthy that a particularly severe encounter has place in his narrative just before the account of the withdrawal from Galilee. It is a fair conjecture that Mark himself thought of the withdrawal as resulting from the encounter, though he makes no statement to that effect. We have seen that the Pharisees were the most representative and popular party, and the profession of scribe the most important and respected profession, among the Jews. We have direct evidence showing that Jesus shared in the general respect for the scribal office (Matt. 23:1-3a, 34), and that his contacts with individual scribes and Pharisees were not always of hostile character (see *e.g.* Mark 12:28-34). Yet nothing connected with his life stands out more clearly than the fact that he considered some of these leading figures among his countrymen to be unlovely characters, and that beliefs and practices which lay near the heart of the scribism of his time were thoroughly repugnant to him.

At first thought it may seem unfortunate that so large a part of the meager data about Jesus which has come down to us should have to do with the controversies between him and the Pharisees, but upon reflection we are likely to see the matter in a different light. In those of his teachings which were somewhat closely connected with his proclamation of the coming Kingdom we see him in the role of idealist, Utopian, and it is well that we should see him thus. But the controversies reveal a strain of realism in him which is not less worthy of note. The striking thing about the position which he takes in nearly all of these encounters is its rugged common sense, its unerring grasp of reality, the way in which he has probed beneath externals to the heart of things. His point of view, we see over and over again, is very similar to that of the scientifically trained mind of to-day. If we

are to see him in a way that is at all adequate we must recognize not only his sense of God but also his sense of fact, and it is this in particular which the controversies bring to our view. It may well be that the crisis in Galilee was brought on by his blunt declaration anent the matter of ceremonial washings, that the attempt to correct the inner ills of man's nature by purely external measures is futile in the last degree (Mark 7:1-23). It was a point on which he would not compromise.

Yet an element of choice, as well as compulsion, may have entered into the decision to remove from his native land for a time. At two earlier points in his narrative Mark has referred to attempts of Jesus to "withdraw" with his disciples without leaving Galilee (3:7; 6:31). In the second of the two cases the reasons given for the move are a desire for rest, and as may be inferred, for closer and more private association with his disciples. But in both cases the attempt failed. Perhaps we may assume that the same motives had a place in his later decision to withdraw entirely from Galilee.

That compulsion and choice were both operative is by no means incredible. The motives which yield important decisions and actions are usually complex. Certainly we shall make poor progress toward an understanding of Jesus' life, at this as at other points, so long as we fail to allow due significance to forces operating on that life from without. The Docetic error of assuming that he was independent of such forces had much more excuse in the second century than it has in the twentieth.

We are told of three important events which occurred during this period of wandering. In the first place, a mutual understanding was reached between Jesus and his most intimate followers that he was indeed the Messiah long awaited by his countrymen. No doubt this conviction had formed itself in the minds of the disciples

gradually, being based on what they had seen of his work and, even more, on the impression made by close personal contact with him. It is true that the author of the Fourth Gospel thinks of the conviction as full formed from the first (*e.g.* John 1:41, 45, 49), but we do not get this impression from the earlier accounts. It is fully credible that these close friends of his had all along entertained the hope that he would prove to be the expected deliverer, but the first evidence in the Synoptic Gospels of the hope having ripened into full conviction appears here, in the account of Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi (Mark 8:27-30). Whatever may have been the cause or causes of Jesus' giving up his work in Galilee, the confidence of this inner circle had not been shaken. They not only remained loyal to him but were increasingly sure of his great destiny. To Jesus this fact must have been a source of great comfort and strength. To us it stands out as evidence of the impression made by his character and personality.

We have already, in connection with the baptism incident, raised the question of when Jesus himself became convinced that he was the Messiah of Jewish hopes. Here again the Fourth Gospel thinks of the conviction as fully formed from the first, while the Synoptic accounts suggest that it came more gradually, in a manner more in harmony with normal psychology. Yet we must allow for a difference in psychic processes between Jesus and his followers. It is clear that to Jesus, as to all of us, knowledge came through the slow processes of thought and over the long and devious road of experience. But in his case it is equally clear that thought and experience were supplemented at times by flashes of insight that came through vision or ecstasy. So it has been always with great mystics and saints. The temple incident at the age of twelve, the baptismal vision, the temptations —all must be included in the reckoning if we would see

the background of Jesus' Messianic consciousness. It is likely that the baptismal vision contributed most directly, but neither it nor all of these more intense spiritual experiences together must be thought of as displacing normal processes of thought or normal reactions to the impact of events.

This caution is especially pertinent as we pass to the second of the three significant events—Jesus' beginning to tell his disciples that suffering and death lay ahead of him. How did he know? What led him to foresee the tragic end to which his life and work would come? We may find the answer partly in Scripture prophecy and partly in the stern logic of events. There can be little doubt that the latter part of Isaiah was one of the parts of the Scriptures which made the strongest appeal to him. From it he had taken the text for his sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth in which he had announced himself as a messenger of helpfulness, a bringer of good news. But the most distinctive matter in this part of the book of Isaiah is the matter of the "Servant" passages, and there is evidence that these also came to have deep significance for Jesus, helping him to see more clearly the path which lay ahead of him. We are told that he began to teach his disciples that the Son of man must suffer, be rejected, be killed (Mark 8:31). What did he mean by the *must?* He meant, almost certainly, that it was according to the divine program as indicated in Scripture, and that could point only to the Servant passages. At the last supper, according to Luke's report, he made this plain: "For I say unto you, that this which is written must be fulfilled in me, 'And he was reckoned with transgressors': for that which concerneth me hath fulfillment" (Luke 22:37). The quotation is from Is. 53:12 (see further, Mark 10:45; Matt. 12:17-21).

Yet Berguer rightly protests, in the name of psychology, at the notion that Jesus could have yielded to a

dogmatic necessity of this sort unless the course of events was clearly pointing to the same necessity:

> ". . . how little one must know about the nature of great souls and the struggles of flesh and blood to believe that Jesus could have coolly faced the necessity of dying as the prophets had predicted if no other historical or existing facts, no concrete reality, had pointed to the same thing! These ideas are not of the sort one accepts so easily when one is a living man. . . . It was when he heard the Father's call, in events, on the one hand, and on the other in his obligation that he joined the two ends of the chain: Messianic prophecy and death (*op cit.,* 232.)

The third event was the transfiguration, apparently another of the great psychic experiences which marked turning points in Jesus' life. The scene was "on a high mountain," most naturally understood as one of the spurs of Mt. Hermon near Caesarea Philippi. We are told that his appearance became transformed, that Moses and Elijah appeared talking with him, and that again, as at the baptism, a heavenly voice designated him as "my beloved Son." To estimate the significance of these several portents a good deal of conjecture is required. The Gospel writers were interested in them as portents, and their accounts throw but little direct light on their significance. The experience would seem to have meant for Jesus a reaffirmation of his baptismal call at a time when the outlook for his mission had undergone decisive change. He had passed through frequent discouragements since the call first came to him, and it seemed all but certain that darker days were yet ahead. The call might appear to have been belied. Yet here on the mountain his face was transfigured, his being suffused with calm and joyous confidence. The voice was heard once more. He knew that he was facing suffering and death,

but he knew also that he was still, and always, the Father's chosen Son. Suffering and death would be the gateway to the fulfillment of his work. According to Luke (9:31) it was "of his decease which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem" that Moses and Elijah talked with him. Thus the ecstatic experience on the mountain but confirmed the conclusion to which his pondering of Scripture, coupled with his observation of events, had been leading him. Yet its value was no doubt greater than that statement would indicate. It is from spiritual experiences, more than from sense observations and intellectual processes, that help and strength for life's great issues are derived. It was soon after the great day on the mountain, we gather, that Jesus brought his period of wandering to a close and set his face not only toward his native land but toward Jerusalem, its capital.

D. Jerusalem: The Closing Scenes.

The time spent on the journey from the Caesarea Philippi neighborhood to Jerusalem seems not to have been very long. Holtzmann's conclusion is that "It can hardly be supposed to have lasted longer than two weeks" (*Life of Jesus,* 366). He estimates the traveling time at fifty hours (*ibid.,* p. 348). At Capernaum, the old headquarters, there was only a brief halt. South of Galilee the route chosen lay through Perea, on the east side of the Jordan, and here, we are told, there was a resumption of public activities. Mark says that "multitudes came together unto him again; and, as he was wont, he taught them again" (10:1). Yet the idea of an extensive "Perean Ministry"—a conception perpetuated even in standard modern books—is almost certainly erroneous. Luke has a large block of narrative and teaching material at this point (Luke 9:51-18:14), but a good deal of it seems to belong, chronologically, in the Galilean period.

Mark's picture is of a fairly continuous journey, with only what might be called a ministry *enroute* (see 10:17, 32, 46). The Passover season was near at hand and there must be no undue delay in reaching the capital.

As Jesus and his disciples approached Jerusalem crowds of Passover pilgrims attached themselves to his little band, so that he entered the city with a numerous—though doubtless not otherwise impressive—retinue. He himself rode on an ass, for the use of which he seems to have arranged in advance (Mark 11:1-6). In this manner of entrance the author of Matthew sees a fulfillment of the oracle of Zech. 9:9-10—a striking and unusual picture of an ideal ruler who would be a pacifist, not a warrior. "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy king cometh unto thee; he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt the foal of an ass. And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem; and the battle bow shall be cut off; and he shall speak peace unto the nations: and his dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth." It is at least an attractive conjecture that Jesus himself had this passage in view when he planned the manner of his entrance into the capital. Though he had adopted the conception of Messiahship as expressing his mission better than anything else that was available, he must have felt that it lacked a good deal of being entirely satisfactory. Ideas were associated with it which were foreign to his own interests and ideals, for example, the ideas of war, of conquest, and of kingly pomp. But we have seen that the conception of what the Messiah would be and do was far from being standardized, and this fact made it the more possible for Jesus to use it. He could interpret it in his own way, calling to his aid prophetic passages usually associated little if at all with the Messianic hope. Such prophetic matter he found

particularly in 2 Isaiah, but it would be surprising if this remarkable oracle in Zechariah had not also appealed to him as aptly expressing the mission which his Father had willed for him. He would enter Jerusalem as king but not as a warrior king. His desire was to "speak peace unto the nations," not to "break them with a rod of iron," like the Messiah of the Second Psalm.

In Jerusalem, as in Galilee, Jesus came into contact with the Pharisees, in particular with the Pharisaic scribes. They were present, and influential, alike in the capital and the provinces. But in the capital he encountered also another group scarcely less prominent, the Sadducean priests. We have seen that this was the aristocratic party, representing a formal and political interest in religion rather than the view of it as a spiritual and ethical force. This was the Sadducean tendency in general, and at this time the leaders of the party—the "chief priests" of whom the Gospel writers speak—seem to have constituted a particularly vicious and unscrupulous political ring. It was not to be expected that the prophet who had clashed so seriously with the Pharisees in Galilee would readily come to terms with these leaders in Jerusalem. On the day following his entrance into the city—in his act of "cleansing the temple"—he rebuked and challenged them in the most direct way possible. And their reply came speedily. Within a few days, aided by the treachery of Judas, they secured his arrest, and, thanks to their control of the Jewish Sanhedrin and their ability to intimidate the weak and callous Roman governor, his conviction and execution followed without delay. It was as a Messianic agitator that he was condemned and put to death.

In the main the Pharisees seem to have made common cause with the Sadducees against him. We are told, indeed, of one scribe—no doubt a Pharisee—who saw and admitted that the spiritual and ethical conception of

religion for which Jesus stood was the very heart of Pharisaic Judaism at its best (Mark 12:28-34; cf. Matt. 22:34-40). Doubtless there were others less vocal who also felt well disposed toward him (cf. John 19:38-42). We recall that Paul, some thirty years later, under similar circumstances, secured support for his cause by declaring that he was a Pharisee and that the attack on him was an attack on things for which Pharisaism stood. It was true, in Paul's case, and Jesus might with truth have said the same. With the Pharisaism of the 119th Psalm, for example, he must have felt the closest sympathy. Nevertheless he could not have employed Paul's tactics without subterfuge, without compromise—and that is to say that he could not employ them at all. His experience in Galilee had taught him—to his very great grief, we must suppose—that real coöperation with the typical Pharisee of his time was not possible.

And it is to be remembered that the breach between Jesus and the Pharisees was certain to make the populace more hesitant in their support of him than they otherwise would have been. As it was they were a good deal excited over his activities, so that his enemies, powerful though they were, realized that they must move cautiously in their plans for crushing him (Mark 14:1-2). If leading Pharisees had supported him against the temple clique, the people would no doubt have rallied to him, and the end of the story might have been very different. Different, yes—but better? That does not appear. It is an alluring exercise of the imagination to think of Jesus as a successful reformer of Judaism from within, making peaceful terms with the Romans and proceeding to the development of his Utopia in Palestine. Would we wish it so, rather than for his life to have ended as it did? Can we imagine any possible achievements of his, however long he might have lived and taught and worked, that would have influenced humanity

so profoundly, have contributed to world progress so uniquely and significantly, as did his death upon the cross?

But it is one thing to ask and answer such questions from the point of view of to-day, in the light of nineteen centuries of subsequent history; it is quite another thing to try to picture to oneself Jesus' own outlook, toward the present and the future during those fateful days in Jerusalem. The latter undertaking is difficult, yet it need not be entirely vain. If we but recognize the natural working of those traits of character and personality which have revealed themselves earlier, not a great deal will be left that will seem mysterious—such traits as his sense of fact, his loyalty to his mission, his trust in God, in particular. He saw what was coming and accepted it as the will of God, indeed as the divinely appointed way in which his mission was to be fulfilled. His attitude was not one of passive fatalism nor of morbid craving for martyrdom. He seems to have come to Jerusalem not merely to die, in fulfillment of Scripture, but with the intention of carrying on an aggressive mission in the capital as long as his life was spared. There were moments, as in Gethsemane, when he shrank from the ordeal ahead of him as any normal man would have shrunk. Probably he could have escaped without great difficulty even at that late hour, and we can scarcely doubt that the temptation to do so—and thus prolong his life and work—came to him with great force. If only he could have felt that such was his Father's will! But he could not. It was through his death that his mission must be fulfilled.

Just how, in his thought, was his mission to be fulfilled through his death? Was his attitude simply one of trust that his Father, who had willed his death, had also willed that death should lead to victory; or did he see the future in more concrete detail? It is the latter

answer, undoubtedly, which the Gospels give. Along with his prediction of his death they include repeatedly an accompanying prediction that after three days he would rise again (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:34). Nor is this all. Detailed predictions of a spectacular future "Coming" from heaven with his Kingdom are put into his mouth (Mark 13; Matt. 24-25; Luke 21; etc.), preceding and accompanying events—woes, celestial marvels, resurrection of the dead, judgment, etc.—being described in the manner familiar to readers of Jewish apocalyptic literature. What shall we say of this material? Does it correctly represent what Jesus thought and said? That he foretold his resurrection is not incredible, especially in the light of such a passage as Is. 26:19. The three days may have been meant in the general sense of "a short time," as in Hos. 6:2. As to the other material it is impossible to speak with certainty. We know that in the early church, at the time when the Gospels were taking shape, these apocalyptic ideas were very much in vogue. It is likely that a good deal was read back into the teachings of Jesus which was not originally a part of them. But we cannot explain everything in this way. There is little room for doubt that Jesus' own thought of the future was clothed somewhat in current apocalyptic forms.

Must we conclude, then, that his expectations were falsified? Not in any vital sense. He was assured that his mission had not failed and would not fail—that his death, on the contrary, would prove his victory. This was the heart of his hope, his faith, his trust, his confidence. And in this he was not mistaken. One wonders, rather, whether the victory which he expected can possibly have been as great as the victory which he has already achieved.

CHAPTER XX

NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY: THE RISE AND SPREAD OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

A. Appearances of Jesus After His Death and Burial.

Three of the Gospels—Matthew, Luke, and John—close with accounts of appearances of Jesus alive after his death and burial. The original ending of Mark unfortunately is lost, but at the point where the narrative breaks off the author is apparently preparing the way for an account of an appearance in Galilee such as that with which Matthew ends (Matt. 28:16-20). The narrative of Acts begins with a reference to Jesus having "shown himself alive after his passion by many proofs" (1:3), and proceeds to describe how from these appearances the Jerusalem church—ultimately the whole Christian movement—took its start. Paul—an earlier witness than either Gospels or Acts—in like manner affirms both the fact of such appearances and their fundamental significance (1 Cor. 15:1-11).

The Gospel accounts, here as at the beginning, show many divergences. It is likely that Mark, the earliest Gospel, originally told of Jesus' appearing in Galilee and only there (see 16:7-8). Luke, on the other hand, seems to know nothing of any appearances in Galilee or anywhere else except in the neighborhood of Jerusalem. Matthew follows the Galilean tradition, though in a couple of verses (28:9-10), which rather interrupt the context, he tells also of Jesus meeting the two Marys as they ran away from the tomb. In John both lines of

tradition are represented, though it is only in Chapter 21—apparently an appendix to the original work—that there is an account of an appearance in Galilee. This account is not in any way parallel to Matthew's Galilean appearance, and the Jerusalem appearances recorded in John have but slight points of contact with those of Matthew and Luke. There is divergence also with respect to the period of time covered by the appearances. Luke's incidents seem to be included within a single day—the second day after the crucifixion, which was the third day according to Jewish reckoning. Everything is made to occur on this one day—from the discovery of the empty tomb to Jesus ascension to heaven. Such, at any rate, is the plain implication of the narrative, notwithstanding the fact that in Acts, apparently written by the same author, the appearances are said to have extended over forty days (Luke 24; Acts 1:3). John's two Jerusalem appearances are included within an eight day period (20:26), while his Galilean appearance requires but a single day. Neither in John nor in Matthew is there any indication as to how long a time elapsed between the appearances in Jerusalem and those in Galilee. Finally, it is to be noted that Paul extends the period to include the appearance to himself, which would make it cover several months—possibly several years.

Such are some of the major divergences: there are numerous minor ones. Yet they do not amount to absolute contradictions, unless it be in a very few instances. It is possible to conclude from the confused evidence that no such appearances of Jesus ever occurred, that either hallucination or deliberate invention lies back of the stories which the New Testament has preserved. Such views have often been put forth (cf. Matt. 28:15). They have not, however, been adopted by the best modern scholarship. The confused evidence—it is now

pretty generally agreed—does not prove that no such appearances ever occurred. The testimony of Paul alone should be sufficient to establish that they did. What the evidence does demonstrate is that in the period when the Gospels were taking shape there was no fixed tradition in the church as to the nature and circumstances of the appearances.

The appearances were real: were they also *physical?* Such was clearly the view of the authors of Matthew, Luke, and John—probably of Mark as well. It has been the view maintained by orthodox Christianity down through the centuries. It is still maintained by conservative Christian scholars, by some scholars who are classed as "liberal," and by the great majority of Christian people in general.

However, it is undeniable that among those who have devoted serious study and thought to the subject a large and increasing number are disposed to think that the resurrection appearances of Jesus were spiritual rather than physical. It is noteworthy that while the Gospel writers, Luke and John in particular, are at pains to cite proofs of the reality of the appearances—to them a bodily reality—yet interspersed with these very proofs are evidences of a different sort. Jesus appears in a room with the disciples when the doors are shut. Sometimes he is not recognized at first. These and other details point in the direction of immateriality. Even more significant, in this connection, is the testimony of Paul. He clearly thinks of the appearances to Peter, the Twelve, and the others as having been of the same character as the appearance to himself on the way to Damascus, and there is every reason for assuming that that appearance was spiritual, psychical, rather than physical.

But what of the stories of the empty tomb which all four Gospels contain? One answer is that they represent a legendary growth with no foundation in actual

fact. Modern psychology has shown how deep-rooted is the human tendency to materialize spiritual reality; and the Jewish mind in particular had difficulty in conceiving of life that was real and full without being bodily. But there is also another possibility. It may be that the burial, in the family tomb of an aristocrat, had been intended to be only temporary, and that without the knowledge of Jesus' followers his body was soon removed. That legendary accretions have attached themselves to the stories is obvious in any case. How much or how little of fact lies back of them we shall doubtless never know.

It has been, and is, widely assumed by Christian people that belief in Jesus' resurrection can have little reality, and can provide but little dynamic for life, unless his resurrection is conceived as an actual emergence of his body from the grave. This view has been so often and so persuasively expressed that we need not repeat the statement of it here. It may be worth while, however, to devote a little space to a setting forth of the opposite, less familiar, view; quoting from a recent writer who is alive in unusual measure to the claims and value alike of religion, psychology, and Biblical scholarship.

Berguer thinks that

> it was by yielding instinctively to the law of least resistance that they [the first Christians] soon began to project the drama of the death and Resurrection of Christ into the physical realm, to restrict and relegate it to the corporeal, to turn it into a material and organic process which one could henceforth limit oneself to contemplating from the outside without living it. . . . Deeply engraved upon all the myths of the dead and risen gods of antiquity we find this fallacious fulfillment of human desire. And this same tendency to replace life by the game of life,

> the action by the spectacle, has continued to operate in the human mind since the career of Jesus as it did before. . . . Jesus gave himself entirely to men; he is dead but he lives; through him and in him one can, then, by dying, live also. But to evade this communion of the spirit, which is a struggle, a torture, a death followed by the crowning of life, to evade risking itself in the adventure, human nature invents a subterfuge and substitutes a physical magic for the communion of the spirit. It returns, by a detour, to the old myth. . . . To avoid participating in a death and a resurrection which are meaningless unless we realize them ourselves, in ourselves, through Christ—to escape this spiritual test which passes through sacrifice before attaining to glory, our indolent dream invents a special body, a miraculous flesh which alone could escape corruption and, also alone, return to life—a spectacle, in short, in which it is sufficient to believe and in which we are exempted from taking part. . . . The experience of the Resurrection of Christ is perhaps the supremely triumphant and the most powerful of the Christian experiences, but it is not the affirmation of a material fact; it is the irrevocable testimony of a spiritual contact which takes place only along the path of death to self. (*Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus,* 285-293.)

Berguer of course does not mean to imply that deep and vital Christian experience never accompanies belief in Christ's resurrection as physical. But he holds that such experience

> is not in virtue of their belief in the material fact of the Resurrection but rather because, aside from this belief, they have lived in direct communion with Christ and have passed with him through that death

> which leads to life. Unfortunately, there are others who, inheriting from their co-religionists only the belief without the experience, firmly uphold the material fact of the Resurrection without ever having known what it was to die and return to life, because they have been content to believe without living, without passing through the vital experiences that make a Christian of a man. (*Ibid.*, 293-294.)

B. Effects of the Appearances on His Followers.

During their association with him in his lifetime there had been a good deal about Jesus which his followers had found hard to understand. In time they had become convinced that he was the expected Messiah, but upon his arrest and execution all that their ardent hope and faith had seen in him seemed falsified. The impression which his personality had made upon them must still have been vivid, but their vision of the impact which that personality would make upon the nation and the world had perforce vanished with his death. If he did indeed foretell that he would live after death, as the Gospels state, it is evident that the impression made by his words was not such as to yield comfort and confidence in the face of the catastrophe on Calvary. They had "kept hoping" that he was the one who should redeem Israel (Luke 24:21), but now they saw no further ground for hope.

Such was the outlook immediately following the Passover time at which Jesus was crucified. At Pentecost, seven weeks later, all was transformed. One and then others of his followers were able to tell of having seen him—had fellowship with him—alive. The resurrection experiences turned darkness into light—and led to the founding of the Christian church.

These experiences, for one thing, had thrown a flood of new light on the question of their Master's work—

how his Messianic mission was to be fulfilled. They had been right, they concluded, in identifying him with the promised Messiah; but they had been wrong in assuming that his Messianic work, strictly speaking, was to be done in the course of the life which had now come to an end. That had been a natural assumption, but it had been a mistake. As they now saw it this life had been but a preparation for the real Messianic mission which was yet to be accomplished. For the time being he was removed from their midst, except for the occasional appearances vouchsafed to them. But he was not in Sheol, the shadowy realm of the dead. God had taken him to his own right hand. From this vantage point his mission could and would be realized in a manner transcending all their dreams. And the time, their glowing faith told them, would not be long. He would soon return, with power and glory, and then their fondest hopes would be realized.

It need scarcely be said that the program thus constructed for Jesus was not original with his followers. They were simply availing themselves of the apocalyptic, as opposed to the national-hero, type of Jewish hope. During his lifetime it would scarcely have been possible for them to have thought of him as apocalyptic Messiah. He was on earth with them, sharing their daily life, whereas the vision of the apocalyptists was of a kingdom prepared in heaven and sent directly from God. No doubt the national-hero type of Messiahship was more congenial to the average Galilean, and, in any case, within the range of his understanding. National deliverance under the leadership of one of their own people whom God should anoint for the task—it was upon this that their hopes most naturally focused, and this was the mission which their faith had told them, almost to the end, that Jesus would yet fulfill. But his crucifixion had proved that in this they were wrong, and

the resurrection appearances had opened up to them the new and more glorious outlook—an apocalyptic Messiahship, the consummation of which was yet to be.

This new outlook finds repeated expression, in one form or another, in the opening chapters of Acts: "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified (2:36); "Repent ye therefore . . . that he may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things, whereof God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets that have been from of old" (3:19-21); "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye looking into heaven? this Jesus, who was received up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven" (1:11). (If we read "Messiah" instead of "Christ," in these passages, the sense will perhaps be more clear.)

Thus did he who had been their beloved leader, teacher, comrade, friend become, in the thought of his followers, a divine being at God's right hand, soon to return as king and judge of humanity. An unfortunate aspect of the transition was that henceforth the facts as to Jesus' human life tended to be lost sight of or colored by the influence of ideas about him in his exalted, official capacity. Yet we must not jump at the conclusion that the Christ of faith had little or no connection originally with the Jesus of history. We must rather assume that originally the connection was close—that the tremendous impression made by Jesus' character, personality, and work not only created the psychological background for the resurrection experiences of his followers but also made it possible for them, as it would not otherwise have been, to clothe him with the divine attributes ascribed to him even in the earliest strata of the New Testament. It has rather been in subsequent centuries, when the earthly

life has been obscured and its eternal significance has had expression only in language that has lost its warmth and reality, that the church has suffered for want of an adequately grounded Christology.

It is to be noted, further, that the new view of Jesus' Messiahship carried with it, for his followers, a new program for themselves. It had for them the very great value of giving them something immediate and definite to do. Their task was to gain recruits for their Lord's Kingdom against the time when he should return. In the nature of the case the program as they saw it was to win individuals rather than to reform society. The present world was not to be reformed but to be swept away. But this element in their outlook was less a source of weakness than we might suppose. Time would inevitably bring about some change of emphasis in this respect, and it was doubtless well, in the beginning at least, that the emphasis should have been placed where it was.

Again, the new view gave to the infant church what may be called a potential universality. It is true that the universal character of the movement did not manifest itself at once. It had to be practically forced out of Judaism before it began to knock at the doors of the Gentile world. But the point is that the possibility of the spread of Christianity into the wide world was present in the new interpretation of Jesus as it was not in the old. It is not easy to conceive of the followers of a Messiah who had been born a Jew, and whose mission was to reëstablish the ancient kingdom of David, going forth to win the allegiance of Gentiles while their own people remained deaf to their appeals. And even if we can imagine such effort being made, it was not likely to meet with great success. But with their faith centered in a Messiah who was to be revealed directly from heaven—sent by the God of all the earth—the matter was different. In thus making itself heir to the broader

type of Jewish hope the sect of the Nazarenes was already revealing its capacity to become a religion for all mankind.

C. The Life of the Primitive Community.

The Feast of Pentecost, the next great festival occasion after the Passover, at which Jesus was crucified, was a natural time for a group of his dispersed disciples to get together again. We cannot be far wrong in supposing that at this meeting the main theme of conversation would be the intercourse which different ones of them had had with their Leader since his death. And while they were discoursing upon these great themes a new feeling came over them, a hitherto unexperienced ecstasy took possession of their beings. They interpreted it as a gift of the Holy Spirit, "poured forth" by their Lord from the exalted position which he now occupied at the right hand of God (Acts 2:33). The experience was destined to be repeated often, not only in this original group but in other Christian communities. It is, indeed, an outstanding feature of the religious life which the New Testament reveals. The description of it and its accompanying phenomena, in the opening chapters of Acts, reveals a background of thought very different from that of our modern world, but it is an inspiring description none the less. The idea of the Spirit being poured forth out of heaven could be taken quite literally in the first century: it obviously cannot be so taken by those who accept the world-view of to-day. Again, from the point of view of Acts the infallible proofs of the Spirit's presence were to be found in such phenomena as the gift of tongues and the performing of miracles. It is the same point of view as that of the Old Testament. There it is only the outstanding men who are spirit-filled; it is only in extraordinary events that the power of God's spirit is seen. To the modern-minded man,

however, the narrative of Acts is impressive in spite of, rather than because of, these elements. He sees in it the vivid sense of the living Christ which this group of his followers possessed—their zeal for doing the task which he had left them to do. It is these factors in the situation that make the history of the first Christian community at Jerusalem an inspiration to the church for all time. It may be remarked in passing that the view that "spiritual gifts," to be worthy of the name, must be spectacular was expressly repudiated by Paul (1 Cor. 12-14).

The author of Acts tells us that "all that believed were together, and had all things common; and they sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all, according as any man had need" (2:44-47; 4:32-37). It would seem from this that Jesus' followers in Jerusalem, for a short time at least, observed a more or less communistic mode of life. It was not unnatural for the new enthusiasm received at Pentecost to express itself in this way, especially since their expectation of the speedy end of the present order would make the possession of this world's goods a matter of small importance in any case. Their master, both by example and precept, had commended freedom from entanglement with material property.

But this communistic practice seems not to have continued long and not to have been copied by other Christian communities. It has no great historical significance, but it has interest as an early manifestation of the "family spirit" which became a recognized characteristic of Christianity in succeeding decades and centuries. The Christians' love for one another became a matter of comment among their heathen neighbors, and in an age when benefit societies were common the Christian communities gained a reputation for exceptional zeal and efficiency in caring for such of their members as

were in need. Happily this trait has survived in Christianity to our own day, as our numerous hospitals and charitable institutions testify. In one respect—the disposition to minister to needy persons outside the group as well as to those within—it may be said that the principle has fuller application with us than in primitive Christianity. On the other hand, modern charity tends to suffer from being committed largely to institutions and hence losing the personal touch.

The two earliest leaders of the Jerusalem community, according to Acts, were Peter and Jesus' brother James. In the opening chapters Peter is the outstanding figure (see 1:15ff.; 2:14ff.; 3:1ff.; 5:1ff.; 5:29ff.; cf. Gal. 1:18). We are not told the reason for his prominence. From the picture which we get of him from the references in various parts of the New Testament we may assume that he was fitted by nature for leadership. There is also one more specific factor which may have had its influence: the fact that Peter was the first of Jesus' followers to see him after his death (1 Cor. 15:5; Luke 24:34). On several occasions we find James sharing Peter's prominence (Acts 12:17; 15:13; Gal. 1:19), and later, at the time of Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, James alone would seem to have been the recognized head of the community (Acts 21:18). We read of Peter at a comparatively early date going out on missionary tours (Acts 8:14ff.; 9:32ff.; 10; cf. Gal 2:11ff.; 1 Cor. 9:5). Perhaps these activities claimed his attention to such an extent that it became necessary for another to assume the position of leadership at Jerusalem. It is doubtful if James during Jesus' lifetime had been more than tolerant in his attitude toward his brother's work (cf. Mark 3:21, 31). But Paul tells us that he was one of those who saw Jesus after he had risen from the dead, and it may be that his conversion dated from this experience. Probably his relationship to Jesus had something to do

with his prominence in the early Christian community. According to Josephus James was brought to trial before the Sanhedrin by the high priest Ananus the younger (about 62 A. D.), convicted of breaking the laws, and condemned to be stoned. Josephus also says that the better class of Jewish citizens strongly disapproved of these proceedings, and that as a result of his action Ananus was deposed from the high priesthood. From Hegesippus we have the statement that James had taken the vow of a Nazarite and was held in great respect for his rigid piety even by his non-Christian countrymen (see Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible,* II, 542).

After 44 A. D.—the point to which Acts 1-12 brings us —we get only occasional glimpses of the state of affairs in the Christian community at Jerusalem. One point which is clear is that this church was conservative in its outlook, particularly with reference to the Gentile mission and the innovations which it brought in its train. At first the membership had included a liberal element—Jews of the Dispersion, for the time being resident in Jerusalem—but the persecution which accompanied and followed Stephen's death would seem to have resulted in this element being driven out and the conservatives left in control. The point of view of the conservatives —James and his associates—was that adherence to the new movement did not in any way involve a denial or abrogation of Judaism, but that on the contrary the requirements of the old religion were obligatory upon all who would embrace the new. The trouble in the church at Antioch which led to the council at Jerusalem was caused by Christians from Judaea—probably from Jerusalem—who had come to Antioch insisting that Gentiles must be circumcised before they could be taken into the church (Acts 15; cf. Gal. 2). No doubt the attempt to "Judaize" the Galatian Christians had its origin in the same place. We recall also how Peter, upon his

return from Caesarea, was taken to task by his brethren in Jerusalem for his breach of Jewish Law and custom in the Cornelius incident (Acts 11:2-3). Paul's vigorous language in Galatians suggests that the breach between the conservative mother church and the more progressive Christian communities in the Gentile world may have been more serious than Acts, with its irenic spirit, would lead us to suppose (cf. Acts 21:17ff.).

Nor is this situation hard to understand. It was inevitable that Jewish Christians living in Judaea should have a narrower outlook as to the nature and mission of the new faith than had Christians who had been accustomed to the very different religious situation which obtained in the Graeco-Roman world at large. As a matter of historical fact Christianity had been born a Jewish sect: it was natural that Jewish Christians should be loath to see it sever its connection with Judaism, even when there was little ground for expecting its acceptance by the Jewish nation as a whole.

Another point of information about the Jerusalem church which has come down to us is its apparently almost chronic state of poverty. References both in Paul's letters and in Acts make it clear that the community was frequently, if not constantly, in need of financial assistance from without (see Gal. 2:10; 1 Cor. 16:1-4; 2 Cor. 8:1-4; 9:1-2; Rom. 15:25-28; Acts 24:17). It has naturally been conjectured that the experiment in communism at the beginning was at least partly responsible for this unfortunate state of affairs; also that improvidence growing out of the current belief in the speedy end of the present world had something to do with it. Persecution is another factor that must be included in the reckoning. In one passage (Acts 11:27-30) famine is said to have furnished the occasion for outside contributions being sent to the Christians of Jerusalem. No doubt the general economic situation in

Palestine, in the unsettled period preceding the war with Rome, was bad. It may be that Christians were no less prosperous than were the corresponding classes of non-Christian Jews.

It is worth while to note in passing that Paul's zeal for collecting offerings among the Gentile churches to be forwarded to the needy brethren in Jerusalem had back of it a motive that was more than merely humanitarian. He hoped in this way to do something toward healing the schism that had arisen between Jewish and Gentile Christianity (see 2 Cor. 9:12-15).

D. The Spread of Christianity from Jerusalem.

The Jerusalem church may be said to have performed its greatest mission, and reached the climax of its development, at an early point in its history. Its greatest mission was destined to be that of serving as the mother church of Christendom, and events prophetic of that destiny were occurring as early as the choosing of the Seven and Stephen's martyrdom.

From the account in Acts of the choosing of the Seven we learn that there were two more or less antagonistic groups in the community. They are referred to as "Hebrews" and "Hellenists," by which is presumably meant native, Aramaic-speaking, Jews of Palestine and Jews who had been brought up in Gentile countries and spoke Greek. We read that the Hellenists complained of unfairness in the administration of the common fund for the relief of the needy, and that the Seven were thereupon chosen as a body which should take this relief work in charge. The names of the Seven are given, and they are all Greek names. The writer goes on to tell of the activities of Stephen, one of the Seven. He "wrought great wonders and signs among the people," and non-Christian Hellenistic Jews who engaged him in argument "were not able to withstand the wisdom and the

spirit by which he spoke" (Acts 6:8-10). They then stirred up the Jewish populace against him, with the result that he was stoned to death and there was a general dispersion of Christians, "except the apostles," from Jerusalem.

This narrative is not as clear as we would wish. There is an obvious discrepancy between the purpose for which the Seven were supposed to be chosen and the activities in which Stephen, and also Philip, actually engaged. We see them engrossed not with administrative duties but with the same work as the apostles themselves—the defense and propagation of the faith. Perhaps in what he says as to the purpose for which they were chosen the author was influenced by what he knew of the functions of the seven deacons who formed part of the organization of a church in later times. However this may have been, there seems to be little room for doubt that the trouble which resulted in a part of the Christian community being driven out of Jerusalem was brought on mainly by the activities of the Greek-speaking element in the community, and doubtless those who were driven out were mainly of this element. The intimation that the apostles escaped molestation is significant. At an earlier period they too had had clashes with the Jewish authorities, but this friction, we are given to understand, had subsided before the appearance of Stephen on the scene. Gamaliel's conciliatory advice to the Sanhedrin had prevailed, and we are told of the apostles that "every day, in the temple and at home, they ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus as the Christ" (Acts 5:42).

Why, then, did Stephen suffer martyrdom for doing what the apostles had won the right to do—that is, for proclaiming Jesus as the Messiah of Jewish hopes? The answer probably is that along with this he combined other causes of offense which they did not. He was charged with having predicted that Jesus would destroy

the temple and "change the customs which Moses delivered unto us" (Acts 6:14), and in the long speech attributed to him he takes a very critical attitude toward both past and contemporary Jewish leadership (Acts 7). Peter's "And now, brethren, I know that in ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers" (Acts 3:17) has a markedly different tone from Stephen's "Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Spirit: as your fathers did, so do ye" (7:51). It is very likely that even before he became a Christian Stephen's Judaism, under the influence of his contacts with the outside world, had taken on a "liberal" cast which would make him seem to the Pharisaic Jew of Palestine to be guilty of dangerous disloyalty.

Such views, as we have seen, were far removed from the thought of native Palestine Christians of the type of James. Their loyalty to the Law and the temple was beyond question. The Jerusalem community would probably not have been disrupted, so early in its history, if it had been made up of this element alone. Also, there never would have been a Christian church.

From what has been said it will appear that at this early period the Twelve may be taken as representative of the strongly pro-Jewish element among the Nazarenes, while in the attitude of the Seven we may see the germ of the separatist tendency. But it has also to be noted that both the Twelve and the Seven speedily disappear from the history. Of the latter group only Philip is heard from after Stephen's martyrdom. We read of him carrying on a very successful missionary work among the Samaritans, converting an Ethiopian eunuch, and going on a preaching tour along the coast of Judaea and Samaria (Acts 8). He is mentioned again in Acts 21:8 as resident in Caesarea, after which we hear of him no more. Of the Twelve only two, John and Peter, have any part in the missionary activities recorded in the New

Testament. Acts mentions James, John's brother, only to record that he was executed by order of Herod Agrippa I (12:2).

John had evidently been a figure of some prominence in the Jerusalem community before the disruption occurred. Acts has him associated with Peter in the healing incident at the temple gate (Acts 3-4). And many years later Paul found him ranking with Peter and Jesus' brother James as one of the three "pillars" of the community (Gal. 2:9). But we are told of only a single occasion on which he took part in the work outside of Jerusalem. This was in Samaria, where again his name is coupled with Peter's in a manner suggesting that he played a secondary role (Acts 8:14-25).

When we try to follow John's career farther we are limited to evidence that is uncertain and contradictory. Since the time of Irenaeus the tradition that he removed to Ephesus and resided there for many years has had wide acceptance in the church. This move was made, according to the tradition, after Paul's labors in Asia Minor had ceased, and henceforth John was a leading figure throughout the whole church of that region. In the reign of Domitian he was banished to the island of Patmos but returned to Ephesus under Nerva and lived till the reign of Trajan (98-117 A. D.). Many stories were told in connection with his life during this long period. Most of these plainly bear the earmarks of legend, but until recent years there has been little disposition to doubt that there was a basis of fact to the tradition of the Ephesian residence. At present, however, many scholars are disposed to reject this tradition in favor of another one attributed to Papias. The latter is supported by several lines of evidence, some of which have recently come to light. It alleges that John, as well as his brother James, was put to death by the Jews. The coupling of his martyrdom with that of James would

suggest Jerusalem as the place of his death, and this is explicitly stated by one of the witnesses. The time is not stated, but it would presumably be before the collapse of the Jewish state in 70 A. D. There is point to the suggestion that this tradition "is favored by our Lord's prediction that both the brothers should drink of the same cup whereof He drank (Mark 10:39). If the prediction had been unfulfilled, there is considerable probability that Jesus' words would have been passed over in silence by the Evangelists" (Wade, *New Testament History,* 227). On the whole it must be regarded as at least doubtful whether the Apostle John had more than a very minor part in the work of propagating Christianity outside of Jerusalem. The Ephesian John was very likely another person—perhaps the one known to Papias as the Presbyter John.

The early disappearance of Peter from New Testament history is even more striking than that of John, since his former role had been one of a good deal greater prominence. After he and John have brought their mission in Samaria to an end we hear of Peter next in the coast region—at Lydda, Joppa, and finally at Caesarea, where he has the experience with Cornelius and his household which seems to the author of Acts so significant (Acts 9:32-11:18). Returning to Jerusalem he is arrested and imprisoned, but escapes and after a brief visit with his friends departs "to another place." He appears again at Jerusalem in Acts 15:7-11 (cf. Gal. 2:9) and at Antioch in Gal. 2:11ff. There is also a reference in 1 Corinthians (1:12) which may be thought to indicate that he worked in the Greek metropolis. But this is not certain, and the New Testament gives no direct information as to his movements after the Jerusalem council of Acts 15. The later tradition that he established Christianity in Rome, and was bishop of the Roman church for twenty-five years, is not credible. If

Peter had founded this church Paul's language in writing to it (see Rom. 1:8-15; 15:14-29) could not well have been so conspicuously devoid of any intimation of the fact. The silence of the Prison Epistles and of Acts 28 would also have to be accounted for. Peter may, however, have visited Rome. Witnesses as early as Clement of Rome and Ignatius couple his name with Paul's in such a way as to suggest a connection of both with the Roman church, while we have the testimony of Tertullian and Caius of Rome to the effect that both apostles suffered martyrdom there.

It is possible that others of the Twelve may have engaged in missionary activities outside of Palestine, but if so reliable evidence as to their work has not come down to us. In later Christian thought the names and fame of the twelve Apostles loomed large, but this was not because of any accurate record of accomplishments on their part which had been handed down. It is clear from the New Testament that the triumphant advance into the Western world—the laying of the foundations of what we know as Christendom—was a work with which the original disciples had little to do.

From Acts we learn that the first important base of operations established outside of Palestine was at Antioch, the metropolis of Syria and according to Josephus the third city of the Empire, outranked only by Rome and Alexandria. The story of how the new religious movement passed from Jerusalem to Antioch is told in one brief paragraph: "They therefore that were scattered abroad upon the tribulation that arose about Stephen traveled as far as Phoenicia, and Cyprus and Antioch, speaking the word to none save only to Jews. But there were some of them, men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Greeks also, preaching the Lord Jesus. And the hand of the Lord was with them: and a great number that

believed turned unto the Lord. And the report concerning them came to the ears of the church which was in Jerusalem: and they sent forth Barnabas as far as Antioch . . . and much people was added unto the Lord. And he went forth to Tarsus to seek for Saul; and when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch. And it came to pass that even for a whole year they were gathered together with the church, and taught much people; and that the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch" (Acts 11:19-26).

It was certain "men of Cyprus and Cyrene," then, Greek-speaking Jewish converts of the party to which Stephen belonged, who began the propagation of the new Faith, among Gentiles as well as Jews, at Antioch. The chief importance of what they did, though they could not know it at the time, lay in the fact that they were preparing the way for the work of one of the greatest religious leaders of all time, Saul of Tarsus, to be known in Christian history as the Apostle Paul. In the person of this one-time persecutor the movement had at length found a protagonist who was adequately equipped for the task of introducing it to the great Graeco-Roman world. It was to be a difficult task, the more so from the fact that the mother church was not at all certain that she wanted Gentiles as recruits, at least unless they were willing to be circumcised and become Jews in the full sense. At the close of its long account of the Cornelius incident Acts says that the Jerusalem brethren, after listening to Peter's explanation and defense of the course which he had taken, "held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then to the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life" (11:18). But if the reader assumes that the question is now definitely settled, and that the race line will henceforth be ignored, he is assuming what proves not to be the case. We shall see that the issue came to the fore again repeatedly in connection with Paul's work.

CHAPTER XXI

NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY: THE LIFE AND WORK OF PAUL

A. Sources.

We have two important sources of information concerning Paul's life and work, and only two: his own letters and the Book of Acts. Of the former there are extant at least eight and at most thirteen, the exact number depending on whether Colossians, Ephesians, 1 and 2 Timothy, and Titus are or are not conceded to have been written or dictated by him. The eight which are now very generally regarded as authentic—after exhaustive criticism and long debate—include the three longest and most important in the collection. Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians, and also three others, Galatians, Philippians and Philemon, which reveal much as to the writer's personality. Being first-hand sources these letters are of the utmost value to the historical student. They are such sources as are unfortunately lacking in the case of Jesus and even the most prominent of the Twelve. It follows from their nature, however, that they do not give us anything like a connected view of the external features of Paul's career from beginning to end. It is in their revelation to us of his character and personality —the inner man—that they excel; and for an understanding of him as a religious thinker and leader this is the most important thing.

The Book of Acts apparently embodies a diary kept by one of Paul's companions during a considerable part of his missionary journeying (cf. above, Chap. V), so

that it also has unique value as a historical source. It supplies to a considerable extent the framework of external events which Paul's own letters fail to provide.

Yet these sources do not make possible the writing of what may be called, in any strict sense, a Life of Paul. When he first appears in the narrative of Acts (at the end of Chapter 7) his childhood and youth are already past and his formal education completed. Again, the long period between his conversion and the beginning of his known missionary activities—some fourteen years according to the generally accepted chronology—is for the most part a blank. Finally, at the end of Acts, he is left a prisoner at Rome. We are uninformed as to his further activities, if any, and the time and manner of his death. Nor is the picture of his inner life which the letters furnish as complete as we could wish. They are remarkably rich and varied in their contents, but their total bulk is small, and the thought life which they reveal is that of a comparatively brief period in Paul's career, probably not more than ten or a dozen years. Since we were to be permitted to see his mind and soul during only one decade of his life it is doubtless well that it should have been this particular decade—near the end, when the fruits of years of experience were ripening. But it would be of great interest and value to us if we could have some letters which he wrote when he was a student in Jerusalem, or during his exile in Arabia.

In this chapter and the one following the attempt will be made to outline the career, and sketch the most important aspects of the personality and work, which these sources reveal.

B. Paul's Early Life.

Paul—or Saul, to use his Jewish name—was born at Tarsus, the chief city of Cilicia, situated between the Taurus mountain range and the sea near the extreme

northeastern corner of the Mediterranean. This evidence as to his birthplace is found in Acts 22:3, where the words are put into the mouth of Paul himself. A tradition preserved by Jerome has it that he was born at Gischala in Galilee and later migrated with his parents to Tarsus. There is no reason for preferring this late testimony to that of Acts, but possibly the tradition may point to this Galilean town as having been the ancestral home of Paul's family. Certain it is that in Paul's childhood home the spirit and customs of the strictest Palestinian Judaism still prevailed, however long or short the family's residence in the Dispersion may have been. He writes to the Philippians that he was "circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews" (Phil. 3:5). He was sent to Jerusalem to be educated under the noted rabbi Gamaliel, and further evidence of the family's connection with Palestine is to be seen in the incident of the sister's son who aided him on the occasion of his last visit to the Jewish capital (Acts 23:16ff.).

Yet no student of Paul's life can doubt that the fact of his childhood and early youth having been spent in Tarsus rather than in Jerusalem, or in a Galilean town such as Nazareth, is a fact of great significance. It is altogether improbable that he attended the Stoic university which flourished in Tarsus, that he read extensively in classical literature, or that he was directly influenced by the pagan religious cults which were prominent in the locality. The influences were more subtle, more indirect, but they were potent influences none the less. When Paul, in later years, went to one after another of the great Gentile cities as a propagator of Christianity he went as one who not only knew their language but was at home with their problems, their customs, their thought. Tarsus had taught him much, and he was not without gratitude. Toward the end of his life we find

him referring with pride to the "not undistinguished city" which he still thought of as home (Acts 21:39).

Citizenship—whether of a city or in the empire—was much more restricted in Paul's world than it is in ours. Hence the fact that he was by birth a citizen not only of Tarsus but of Rome (Acts 22:25ff.) must be taken as indicating that his family was one of distinction and probably of wealth. The rather remarkable consideration which, according to Acts, was shown to him by Roman officials and other persons of prominence is the more readily understood if we may think of him as possessing social standing and being able to draw upon financial resources in time of need. We note that the procurator Felix looked upon him as one who might be expected to produce a tempting bribe (Acts 24:26). The appeal to Caesar, too (Acts 25:11), was a move which doubtless would require considerable funds, notwithstanding the fact that it was technically open to any Roman citizen. There were distinguished Jewish families resident in the great cities of the Roman Empire much as there are in the cities of Europe and America to-day, and to such a family, it would seem, Saul of Tarsus belonged. The fact of his working as tent-maker does not prove otherwise, since it was the custom even in wealthy Jewish families for a son to be taught some handicraft.

Paul's education in Jerusalem is referred to once in his letters (Gal. 1:14) and twice in his speeches as quoted in Acts (22:3; 26:4-5). In the last-named passage he speaks of having lived "from my youth up . . . among my own nation and at Jerusalem." If the ordinary Jewish custom was followed in his case he was probably about fourteen years old at the beginning of this period. What his age was at the end, that is, at the time of the momentous experience on the Damascus road, we do not know. He was still a "young man" at the time of Stephen's death (Acts 7:58), and the impression which

Acts gives is that the conversion experience occurred not long after this. It is probable that the entire public life of Jesus, as well as the early activities of his followers growing out of the resurrection appearances, fell within this period of Paul's residence in Jerusalem; but the aristocratic young rabbi doubtless took little or no interest in the Nazarene peasant, and when his attention was drawn to the new sect which had sprung up after the execution of Jesus his attitude toward it was one of scorn and hostility.

During these years in Jerusalem Paul was continuing the education that had been begun in the home and the synagogue at Tarsus, an education based almost entirely on the Scriptures and the Tradition that was valued so highly by the Pharisees. He was imbibing Pharisaic doctrines and principles, and it is evident that he was as apt a pupil as any teacher could ask. It was his nature to do intensely whatever he did. For the time being he lived in Pharisaism, just as later Christianity was to be to him not merely a theology and a religion but a life. The influence of this training was to go with him to the end. In his letters we meet with it on almost every page. It affects his use of Scripture, as when he says that Hagar and Sarah "are two covenants" and proceeds to develop the point (Gal. 4:21-31), when he draws a fanciful distinction between "seed" and "seeds" in discussing God's promise to Abraham (Gal. 3:16), and when he declares that the rock from which the Israelites drank in the wilderness was Christ (1 Cor. 10:4). It forms the background and the main substance of his solutions of theological and ethical problems, notwithstanding the modifying influences which came from his Gentile contacts and his own deep religious experience.

No doubt we may think that in some cases this strain of Pharisaism in Paul was an element of weakness rather than of strength, but as a whole it should not be so

judged. Happily his personal religious experience, centering in his dramatic conversion, saved him from the worst danger to which Pharisaism was subject, that of making religion largely a mechanical scheme of salvation through detailed observances. And having been saved from the danger himself he was the better able, later, to lead the fight against the same tendency within Christianity. In so far as it is true that Christianity took over what was best in Pharisaic Judaism—its sense of the reality and nearness of God and its strong ethical emphasis—while discarding its provincialism and its devotion to the letter of the law, much of the credit must be given to Paul. But unfortunately Paul's leadership in these matters was too advanced for him to be well understood or consistently followed by those who came after him. He was not always consistent with himself.

It is perhaps worth while to remind ourselves further that Paul was being trained not only by rabbis, in a rabbinical school, but *to be* a rabbi himself. That is to say that he was being trained to be a guide to individuals in the way of life and to be a recognized cultural and religious leader in a community. Peter's training had been that of a fisherman. We know of no other of the earliest propagators of Christianity whose early education had prepared him for such work as Paul's had. It is the less surprising, then, that we know of no other who went about the work in as thoroughgoing and business-like fashion as Paul did. He not only preached but he taught, admonished, warned, rebuked, and he expected to be obeyed. He not only converted individuals but founded churches and exercised supervision over them. He appointed officers, raised collections, and trained lieutenants to assist him in his work. It would be idle to suppose that this conception of his task, and manner of executing it, were due entirely to his training,

but it would be equally unwarranted to assume that the training had nothing to do with it. Assuredly we understand Paul the Christian missionary the better when we include in the reckoning the professional education which he had received. Jesus had not received such an education, and few will regret the fact. Possibly if he had had the clashes between him and the Pharisees would have been less serious, but we can scarcely imagine that the permanent significance of his life and work would have been the greater for anything which rabbinical training could have given to him. But Paul's work was destined to be different, and there is little room for doubt that when his work was nearly finished the thought of the years spent "at the feet of Gamaliel" brought to him both pride and thankfulness (Acts 22:3).

In his attitude toward the Nazarenes, however, Paul did not follow Gamaliel's lead. We read in Acts that the great rabbi stood for calmness and tolerance. His advice was, "Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel be of men, it will be overthrown: but if it is of God, ye will not be able to overthrow them; lest haply ye be found even to be fighting against God" (Acts 5:38-39).

> His young pupil, [as Professor Peabody remarks] was of a less judicial habit of mind. He might be a bigot, but he could not be a neutral. Bred in "the strictest party in our religion," he could not observe with indifference this gathering of "devout Jews from every nation under heaven" in the name of a malefactor whom the Jews themselves had brought to the cross. There were but two conceivable alternatives,—either the humiliating surrender of a scholar's mind to the delusions of these fisher-folk, or else an unspairing opposition to their fanatical claims; and Saul chose the latter. "I once believed it my

> duty," he said, "indeed actively to oppose the name of Jesus the Nazarene." No half-way measures could satisfy such a nature. "I persecuted this Way of religion to the death." (*The Apostle Paul and the Modern World,* 52.)

Yet it is likely that even in that period of his life when he was known as one of the most rigid of the Pharisees —a bitter persecutor of the Christian "way"—even then he was passing through experiences in his inner life which were preparing him for the radical change in outlook which was to come. He was "kicking against a goad" (Acts 26:14), the nature of which can probably be deduced from his language in certain passages in his letters, especially Rom. 7:7-24. Pharisaism exalted the Jewish Torah or "Law," and this was well. The Law was a noble expression of the mind of God. But Paul was being forced to the realization that there was in his own nature something which stood in direct opposition to the mind of God. This opposing principle was strong enough to make the excellent precepts of the Law null and void in the life of an individual, and as a matter of fact it did that very thing. "For we know that the Law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin . . . for not what I would, that do I practice; but what I hate, that I do. . . . So now it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me . . . for to will is present with me, but to do that which is good is not." In short current Pharisaism failed to provide what was most needed —a dynamic which would make right impulses effective, translate sound knowledge and good intentions into a life such as God would approve. Certainly Paul did not arrive at this conviction quickly, or easily. There must have been a struggle, and it is very possible that his extraordinary zeal for Pharisaism at this time, expressed in his bitterness against the Nazarenes, grew out of an

attempt to force himself to maintain his belief in its all-sufficiency.

It has generally been assumed by students of Paul's life that he was deeply impressed by Stephen's words and attitude in the face of death, and that this incident in particular served as a preparation for his own change of front not long afterward. It seems likely that such was the case, though the immediate effect, according to Acts (8:1-3; 9:1-2), was quite the opposite. Stephen's interpretation of Hebrew history as a continued obstinate resistance to the spirit of God may have suggested to Paul his own kicking against the goad, and the prayer of the dying Nazarene for forgiveness for his slayers may well have made an impression on the young Pharisee which remained to haunt him afterward.

Such, we may suppose, were some of the psychological antecedents of the conversion experience.

> Some uneasiness of this kind, implying that Paul was brooding secretly over the meaning of the new faith, together with a sense of moral despair which grew upon him the more conscientious he strove to be, may be conjectured to have lain under the vision near Damascus. While they did not produce it, they created an atmosphere for it. Paul himself naturally calls the change abrupt and sudden, just as he emphasizes its divine reality, upon the other hand, by excluding all human influences. But this does not imply necessarily that he had been unconscious till that moment of any mysterious leaning toward the Nazarene faith or of any questionings about his own position before God, any more than it rules out the possibility that, like Wesley, he was helped in his early Christian hours by pious men, whose names were never known." (Moffatt, *Paul and Paulinism,* 8-9.)

C. His Conversion and After.

The Book of Acts contains three somewhat detailed accounts of Paul's conversion, one given as a part of the general narrative and two others embodied in speeches of Paul's inserted in the narrative at later points (9:3-19; 22:6-21; 26:12-18). They differ a good deal in details, and it is therefore the more fortunate that their accuracy on the most vital points can be verified through allusions to the experience which Paul's own letters contain (1 Cor. 15:5-8; 9:1; Gal. 1:15-17).

Not content with the terror which he was causing in Nazarene circles in Jerusalem, Paul was making preparations to carry his work of destruction farther afield. Learning that members of the new sect had settled in Damascus—presumably as a consequence of the exodus from Jerusalem at the time of Stephen's death—he asked for and obtained letters from the Sanhedrin to the Damascus synagogues, authorizing him to arrest and bring back to Jerusalem any Jews in the Syrian metropolis whom he might find to be adherents of the sect. Armed with this commission and accompanied by a retinue he started on his way. In due time he arrived, but the commission was never fulfilled. "As he neared Damascus in the course of his journey, suddenly a light from heaven flashed round him; he dropped to the ground and heard a voice saying to him, 'Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me. Get up and go into the city. There you will be told what you have to do.' His fellow-travelers stood speechless, for they heard the voice but they could not see anyone. Saul got up from the ground, but though his eyes were open he could see nothing; so they took his hand and led him to Damascus. For three days he remained sightless, he neither ate nor drank." (Acts 9:3-9; Moffatt's translation.) Reading on we learn of the young Pharisee having his sight restored by one of the Nazarenes, being baptized and becoming a member

of their sect, and at once beginning to preach the Name which hitherto had been anathema to him.

As has been said the other two accounts in Acts differ somewhat from this one in details. Here, for example, it is said that Paul's companions heard the voice; in 22:9 it is as explicitly stated that they did not. The Book of Acts was written many years after the event, and it is not surprising that the story had come to be told in different ways. It is also to be remembered that an educated man of the first century like the author of Acts would not view such an experience as would an educated man of the twentieth century, with the results of the study of psychology and of psychical research at his command. It happens that in Paul's own references, in his letters, nothing is said of the voice or the light or the blindness. Whether these omissions are significant may be left an open question: in what he does speak of and stress there undoubtedly is significance. He declares that he *saw Jesus* after his crucifixion, as really and truly as any other of his followers had seen him (and he entertained not the slightest scepticism as to the reality of the experiences which the others had had). He makes it clear, further, that he regarded this appearance of Jesus to him as the decisive turning point in his life. ". . . that he appeared to Cephas; then to the twelve; . . . and last of all . . . he appeared to me also" (1 Cor. 15:5-8); ". . . am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" (1 Cor. 9:1); "For ye have heard of my manner of life in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and made havoc of it. . . . But when it was the good pleasure of God . . . to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles; straightway I conferred not with flesh and blood . . ." (Gal. 1:13-16). It was upon this great experience that he based his claim to be an apostle. It was this that had changed him from

the church's most feared persecutor to her most zealous missionary, and he regarded it as a sudden change. He does not tell us in his letters just how Jesus appeared to him, but that he had seen Jesus was the fact in his life that dominated all other facts.

With regard to Paul's movements following his conversion we have some information from himself (Gal. 1:17-24). This is supplemented by a number of references in Acts (9:23-30; 11:25-26, 30; 12:25). But as we have seen there is a period of a good many years here which remains historically almost a blank. Paul tells us that he spent the three years immediately following his conversion in Arabia and Damascus. "Arabia" would mean some place in the great desert region lying to the east and south of Palestine. Whether nearly all of the three years was spent there we do not know. As to the purpose of the retirement we are able to draw a fairly certain inference from Paul's language in Galatians (1:16b, 17b). He "conferred not with flesh and blood" but "went away into Arabia," presumably that he might have time for reflection and communion with God, time to wrestle with the question of what this revolutionary change in his outlook was going to involve. It was such a move as Jesus had made following his baptismal experience.

At the close of this three-year period Paul returned to Jerusalem for a brief visit of fifteen days. He says that "to visit Cephas" (*i.e.* Peter) was the particular purpose of the journey (Gal. 1:18). In this passage in Galatians he is vigorously defending the independence of his gospel—showing that what he preached about Jesus he had not got merely at second hand from the Jerusalem leaders; hence he is at pains to point out that this visit in Jerusalem was brief and was merely personal. Nevertheless we can scarcely doubt that Paul learned much about the life and work of Jesus at this

time. To say this is not to question that his gospel was indeed independent, as he maintains: what he preached about Jesus had to do rather with his eternal significance than with his earthly life and work.

Of the other "apostles," he says, he saw only James the brother of Jesus, he who was later to succeed Peter as head of the church at Jerusalem.

After leaving Jerusalem he went "into the regions of Syria and Cilicia." He was "still unknown by face unto the churches of Judaea," but they were hearing "that he who once was persecuting us now is preaching the faith which formerly he ravaged" (Gal. 1:22-23). It would seem, then, that Paul, during this long period (variously estimated at from four to ten years) was not in retirement, as he had been in Arabia, but was devoting at least part of his time to the propagation of the new faith in which he had come to believe. But we are entirely without further information as to his activities. Acts (15:23, 41) refers incidentally to Christian groups in Syria and Cilicia; perhaps these owed their origin to Paul's work at this time, but if so it is rather surprising that nothing is known of any letters having been written to them and that there are no references to such churches or such labors in Paul's letters which we have.

Going to Cilicia meant to Paul going home. In Acts it is explicitly stated that he went to Tarsus from Jerusalem (Acts 9:30). We would like to know how the members of his family received him; also whether now, in the light of his broader religious outlook, he took more interest than formerly in the Stoic philosophy taught at the university and in the rites of the local pagan cults. But we have only our imagination to draw upon for information on these points.

We have already (in the last chapter) dealt with the beginning of the work in Antioch, the coming of Barna-

bas to take a hand in it, his going to Tarsus to find Paul and enlist his interest and aid. According to Acts (11:26) their labors in Antioch continued for a year, after which time Barnabas and Paul went to Jerusalem as bearers of a relief fund for the brethren in that city, a fund contributed by the Christians of Antioch. Upon their return they brought John Mark with them. It is from this point that the author of Acts launches into his account of the "First Missionary Journey," on which Barnabas was Paul's fellow-worker and John Mark served as their "attendant" for a time.

Such, as best we can trace them, were the steps by which Paul made the transition from a Jewish rabbi of the most exclusive sect to a Christian missionary to the non-Jewish world. That he should have joined the Nazarenes was remarkable enough; that he should have chosen to devote his life to the propagation of his new-found faith *among Gentiles* may well appear to add to his story another extraordinary element. In reality, however, this is less strange than it may seem. We can see several factors in the situation which would tend to lead him to this choice.

One of these factors was the Gentile associations of his early years. Whatever else he may have owed to these associations it is certain that he had gained from them a familiarity with the life of the Hellenistic world and a sympathy with it which profoundly affected the later course of his life; and we can scarcely doubt that this familiarity and sympathy had much to do with his choice of a field for his Christian activities. Again, it would have been nearly impossible for him to have worked among his fellow-Jews in their own land. To his former associates in Jerusalem he was a renegade, and it was difficult for the Nazarenes to overcome their fear and distrust of him. This phase of the situation is clearly pictured in one of the narratives of Acts. "And it came to

pass, that, when I had returned to Jerusalem, and while I prayed in the temple, I fell into a trance, and saw him saying unto me, Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem; because they will not receive of thee testimony concerning me. And I said, Lord, they themselves know that I imprisoned and beat in every synagogue them that believed on thee. . . . And he said unto me, Depart: for I will send thee forth far hence unto the Gentiles" (Acts 22:17-21).

Yet the fact remains that as Paul himself viewed the matter he was a missionary to the Gentiles *because God had called him* to that particular work—called him through the vision on the Damascus road. ". . . when it was the good pleasure of God . . . to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles . . ." (Gal. 1:15-16). He looked back upon the vision as having meant for him not only a conversion but a call, and the sense of having been thus called served as a constant dynamic in his life and work. He felt himself to be an ambassador, an apostle—one sent upon a great and specific mission, the accomplishment of which, though a toilsome and hazardous task, was a source of fullest joy. He, not less truly than his great Master, might have said, "My food is to do the will of him who sent me, and to accomplish his work" (John 4.34).

D. His Work as a Propagator of Christianity.

In a sense, though not in a very strict sense, Antioch remained Paul's headquarters throughout the period of his known missionary activities. Twice after the first start, according to the narrative of Acts, he returned to the Syrian metropolis, and as often he set forth thence to meet further adventures as a propagator of the new-old religion along the great trade routes of the eastern Mediterranean world. It is from this fact of Antioch having three times served as a starting point that the

division of Paul's labors into three missionary journeys is derived. For purposes of study it is a convenient division, but we should recognize that there is no hint of it in Paul's letters and that it is imposed upon, rather than derived from, the record of Acts. We are told explicitly that in the first instance Paul was commissioned for his work by the church at Antioch (Acts 13:1-4; 14:26-27), but nothing is said of further official commissions when he returned. We get rather the impression that his subsequent journeys were undertaken mainly on his own initiative, and that he went where the spirit led.

The extent of territory covered on the first of the three tours was comparatively small. Paul and his companions sailed to Salamis, the eastern port of the island of Cyprus, journeyed overland to Paphos at the western end of the island, embarked once more and sailed northward to Attalia, on the southern coast of Asia Minor, thence to Perga, a few miles up the river Cestrus from the sea, thence farther northward, across the Taurus mountain range, to Antioch in Pisidia, thence in a southeasterly direction to Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, after which they retraced their route to the coast and sailed for Antioch. Cyprus was not revisited.

The second journey was more ambitious in its scope. This time the start was made by land. The travelers journeyed northward through Syria and westward through Cilicia, again crossing the Taurus range. Derbe, Lystra, and other towns in the same region were revisited. Thence the line of march lay northward and westward—apparently with little time being given to preaching activities—to the port of Troas on the Aegean Sea. The Aegean was crossed by boat and the journey resumed on European soil. In the Macedonian coast region the towns of Neapolis, Philippi, Amphipolis, Apollonia, Thessalonica, and Beroea lay on the route. The next

stops of which we hear are at Athens and Corinth, far to the south in the Grecian peninsula. Upon leaving Corinth Paul recrossed the Aegean, stopped for a short visit at Ephesus, sailed for Caesarea, went up and "saluted the church" at Jerusalem, and then returned to his original base at Antioch.

The third journey was largely a duplication of the second as far as the territory covered is concerned. The route lay northward and westward, through "the Galatian and Phrygian country" to Ephesus, thence around the Aegean through Macedonia to Greece. But this time the return was made over the longer route through Macedonia instead of directly across the sea to Ephesus. From Philippi the travelers took the water route, the principal stops being at Troas, Miletus, Tyre, Ptolemais, and Caesarea. Once more Paul went up and paid his respects to the leaders of the mother church at Jerusalem. It was a fateful visit, and it was not followed, as before, by a return to Antioch. The missionary traveler was arrested at the instigation of his fellow-countrymen and after two years imprisonment at Caesarea, the political capital of Judaea under the Roman governors, taken under guard to Rome.

So much for the bare geography. Around the shores of the Aegean and the eastern Mediterranean—where the extreme western projection of Asia stretches out to meet Europe, almost touching the Balkan peninsula—in a region where for centuries the Orient had been meeting the Occident, here it was that Paul's work was done. The region was the seed-plot of what we call the modern world, and this Jew of Tarsus must be reckoned among the foremost sowers of the seed.

As to the time spent on the several journeys little can be said with definiteness or certainty. Acts speaks of three years having been spent in Ephesus (20:31; cf. 19:8-10). There is also a reference to a residence of a

year and six months in Corinth on the second journey, and another to a stay of three months in Greece on the third. We must assume, then, that work in the two great metropolitan centers of Ephesus and Corinth occupied the missionary for nearly five years. The total length of the period covered by the journeys is usually computed at nine or ten years, archeological evidence being used to piece out the meager data of the New Testament. The dates are fixed by different methods of computation at 45 to 48 A. D. for the beginning of the period and 54 to 58 for the end. It was a momentous decade in Christian history. At its close the new religion had been planted in most of the strategic centers of the Empire, and the main lines along which Christian thought was to develop for many centuries had been marked out—largely through the work of Paul.

Thus his activities appear to the student of to-day, who looks at them in the perspective given by nearly nineteen centuries of subsequent history. How did they look to Paul himself? What was he trying to do during these strenuous years? What were the objectives that he had in view? He was trying to propagate Christianity: so much is obvious. It is also obvious that Christianity to him was not only a way of salvation but *the* way. His attitude on this point was that of the Jew, not of the Hellenist. But salvation from what? How? To what? *From* the evil world and the evil self; *through* Christ; to fellowship with God—a life of high individual and social morality, a glorious and happy future life. Such would seem to be the answer in barest outline. The outline can be developed here only to the extent of a few paragraphs

Paul's outlook on the existing world was pessimistic. The same was true of multitudes of his contemporaries. When he wrote of one who had given himself "that he might deliver us out of this present evil world" (Gal. 1:4) he was using the language of Jewish apocalyptic,

yet his readers, in the cities of Galatia, would not have to be familiar with the literature of late Judaism to appreciate his point. Probably to most of them the need of such deliverance would seem to have ample verification in daily observation and experience. And in the same passage Paul speaks also of Christ having given himself "for our sins." Evil in the self, as well as in the world, must be reckoned with. The evil, to be sure, was not unmixed with good, and here Paul found much material for speculative thought (*e.g.* Rom. 7), but underneath the speculation was a solid basis of experience. Doubtless the Stoic preacher might seem to have had the advantage of Paul in his calmer, more balanced view of the world and of man, but actually the advantage was the other way. Stoicism was too calm, too evenly balanced, for a world that was upset. The evil world and the evil self were realities, and no small part of the power of Paul's preaching must have lain in the full recognition which he gave to them.

Deliverance from the evil world and the evil self was to be through Christ. That may mean—as Christian history has abundantly shown—almost anything that one chooses to make it mean. To Paul himself it meant a number of different, not fully harmonized, things. Yet what was central in his thought seems clear. We see it when we study his contrast of *faith* and *grace* with *works* and *law* (*e.g.* Rom. 3:21-28). The deliverance which he proclaimed was to be through an agency that was spiritual, mystical, yet warmly personal, as over against salvation offered by any external, mechanical agency, or through duties observed by rote (*e.g.* Gal. 2:16; 3:1-5; 5:2-6; 4:8-11). Moreover this Agent, and he alone, was great enough, divine enough, for so great a work. He was in a unique sense God's Son. It was he "whom God set forth" (Rom. 3:25). Such was Paul's conviction about Christ as Savior, deliverer. No doubt all, or

nearly all, of the separate items could have been furnished by current Judaism and primitive Christianity on the one hand or by the Mystery religions of the Gentile world on the other hand. But the conviction was something more than the sum of the items. There went with it a passion and a power which could come only from a mighty personality and through a profound spiritual experience. Hence its effectiveness; hence the reality which men still feel in it, notwithstanding changes affecting the very foundations of religious thought.

Paul's answer to the question *To what?* had in it elements alike of the mystical, the ethical, and the eschatological. Deliverance from the evil world and the evil self meant, for one thing, the priceless boon of present and continued fellowship with God. Probably we should say that this was the greatest thing which it meant to him, and which he wanted it to mean to those to whom he preached—the greatest thing not as being the fulfillment but rather the foundation, the source, the dynamic of life for him who would make life rich, and full, and true. This mystical fellowship with God—or with Christ, as Paul often speaks of it—was therefore a *means* to the great ends of life. But to Paul, as to the mystics always and everywhere, it was far from being merely a means. It was life itself, all else being the fruit, the expression of it. Paul's letters which have been preserved to us from this period deal largely with matters of current controversy and of practical daily life. It is therefore the more noteworthy that they are religious, spiritual, and mystical through and through. To have this fact driven home by contrast we have but to turn to an epistle like James'. Paul's mission was first of all *religious*: what he was trying to do was to bring men into touch with God (Rom. 8:31-39; etc.).

His letters show clearly that he was trying also to raise the moral standards of the people among whom

he worked. The moral level of life in the great cities of the Empire was not high: to Paul, with his austere Pharisaic background, it must have seemed to be very low. The situation constituted a challenge which he could not decline. The new life which he himself had found in Christ had given him such strength for daily living as he had not possessed before, and he was confident that for others it would do the same. It was mainly upon this that he relied. The ethical problems which he had to deal with in his work were largely social, but his handling of them was far from being that of a social revolutionist. Revolutionary implications there were, at some points, in the advice which he gave, but his conscious attitude—*e.g.* toward such institutions as the family, slavery, and the state—was that of a conservative (1 Cor. 7:17-24; Rom. 13:1-7, etc). It would not be hard to imagine his having developed into a social revolutionist, had the circumstances of his earlier life been different; but as it was his reactions to problems of social ethics were motivated by a deeply religious nature, a real and keen interest in people, and strong common sense, rather than by a desire to overturn the existing order of things. He expected the existing order to be overturned soon in any case, but it is doubtful if this fact made any great difference. The evil of the "present evil world" did not center in institutions but in people. The remedy was in men having their lives united with God as revealed in Christ and through the in-dwelling Spirit, and so living in purity and in brotherly love with the other children of God.

We may be sure that he would gladly have relied upon this mystical basis for morality more fully than was possible in practice. Perhaps it will always be true that mysticism, for the multitudes, fails to provide all the guidance and the safeguards that morality seems to require. At any rate Paul found it so. There is not

infrequently a pathetic note in his letters, as he reveals his disappointment at finding his "children" unable to take the high road with him (1 Cor. 3:1ff.; Gal. 3:1-5; 4:8-11, 19-20). But he was equal to the emergency. He could feed with milk where he found meat too strong. Seldom indeed has the case for a clean life, a life of service and good will, been put more persuasively or powerfully to the common man (*e.g.* Rom. 12-14; 1 Cor. 5-7; Gal. 5:16-6:10; 1 Thess. 4:1-12; 5:12-22).

But when all is said the chief emphasis in Paul's work was not "social" and not "practical," in the modern sense. It was a religious, a mystical emphasis. In this he was limited—one-sided, if we choose to call him so. But once more it is well to question whether his emphasis did not make both for present effectiveness and for permanence.

Paul's outlook toward the future and its influence on his work in this period are matters of much interest. In common with early Christian leaders in general he had taken over the expectation, developed in certain circles of late Judaism, of a forthcoming cataclysmic end of things, the leading role in the drama being assigned to the returning Christ. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord" (1 Thess. 4:16-17). Thus mysticism and morality were not the only havens of refuge from the present evil world. That world itself was soon to end and be replaced, for Christ's followers, by a new and perfect world. The surprising thing is not that Paul held this view, but rather that holding it so firmly he was yet so far from being dominated by it. There is little of it in his letters, compared with what we might

with good reason expect. It is doubtful if his work would have followed very different lines if he had realized that he was building for centuries instead of for a brief interim period. It was in *the Christ within,* not the Christ above, that his experience and his mission alike centered; and the idea of a Return, for the Christ within, would be meaningless. In the Fourth Gospel, only a few decades later, this view was to be expressed. It may be that Paul's thought was moving in this direction before his work was done.

CHAPTER XXII

NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY: THE LIFE AND WORK OF PAUL (*Cont.*)

It is difficult in a short sketch to do justice to the many-sidedness of Paul's personality and work. The present chapter will deal mainly with his relations with men of various groups—his non-Christian countrymen, the leaders of the mother church at Jerusalem, his fellow-workers and converts, officials of the Empire—with whom he was thrown into contact in the course of his active life. Perhaps the picturing of these relations will contribute as much as anything else to a better understanding of Paul.

A. His Relations with His non-Christian Countrymen.

They were prevailingly unfriendly relations, as far as the evidence of Acts goes. He made Jewish, as well as Gentile, converts—some of them from families of prominence. Crispus, the leader of the synagogue at Corinth, gave heed to his preaching and "believed in the Lord with all his house" (Acts 18:8). But with leading Jews of the more strict and rigid type the reaction was likely to be very different, and these were usually able to stir up a mob of their fellow-countrymen against the heretic. As Acts tells the story there was usually no hostility manifested at first where Paul and his work were not known in advance (*e.g.* Acts 13:14-15; 28:21), but opposition was likely to develop before very long.

The author of Acts presents clearly his view as to the underlying cause of the hostility. The trouble stirred up by the Jews at Pisidian Antioch and at Thessalonica he attributes to "jealousy" (13:45; 17:5). He quotes the charge brought against Paul before the proconsul at Corinth as having been: "This men persuadeth men to worship men contrary to the Law" (18:12-13). He relates that in Jerusalem certain "Jews from Asia" laid hands on Paul in the temple with the cry, "Men of Israel, help: this is the man that teacheth all men everywhere against the people, and the Law, and this place" (21:27-28); and that when Paul, under the protection of Roman soldiers, attempted to speak to the mob he held their attention until he came to the point in his story where the Lord told him that he was to be sent to preach among the Gentiles: then they broke loose again, shouting, "Away with such a fellow from the earth, for it is not fit that he should live" (22:21-22). In short, Paul was hated and persecuted by his non-Christian countrymen because they regarded him as a renegade Jew, faithless to the sacred Law of his people and engaged in activities which tended to break down the wall of division which they believed God Himself had set up between his Chosen People and the rest of humanity. They envied his success in winning Gentiles and were bitterly angry and resentful at him for having achieved his success by what they considered unworthy means. He had won Gentiles in such numbers by letting down the bars—by practically ignoring the Law.

Paul's own letters throw little light on the attitude of his fellow-Jews toward him, but they offer much interesting evidence as to his feeling, after he had become a Christian missionary among the Gentiles, about Judaism and the Jews. That his nation had been "intrusted with" a special revelation from God he was, if possible, even more certain after his conversion to Christianity

than he had been before (Rom. 3:1-2). But it was a revelation which pointed to the Messiahship of Jesus as its fulfillment, also to the inclusion of the Gentiles among the people of God. The "righteousness of God . . . witnessed by the Law and the Prophets" was "through faith in Jesus Christ" and it was "unto all them that believe." There was "no distinction" between Gentile and Jew (Rom. 3:21-30). These vital matters about their religion and their mission the Jews, as a nation, had utterly failed to understand. They had rejected Jesus, and Paul's program for the free admission of Gentiles they bitterly resented and opposed. They had proved faithless to their trust. Would God cast them off? That would have been the simplest and most natural conclusion, especially in view of what Paul had suffered at their hands. But he could not adopt it, for reasons that are characteristic of the man.

There was, for one thing, a theological objection. Would it be *right,* after all, for God to cast off the Jews, when their stubbornness had obviously been a part of his great and glorious plan? (See Rom. 3:3-7.) But more weighty even than the theological difficulty was the protest of patriotism—of deep-rooted racial loyalty. The whole matter of the fate of his people, whom he still loved, weighed heavily on Paul's heart: "I am telling the truth in Christ—it is no lie, my conscience bears me out in the holy Spirit when I say that I am in sore pain. I suffer endless anguish of heart. I could have wished myself accursed and banished from Christ for the sake of my brothers, my natural kinsmen; for they are Israelites, theirs is the Sonship, the Glory, the covenants, the divine legislation, the Worship, and the promises; the patriarchs are theirs, and theirs too (so far as natural descent goes) is the Christ" (Rom. 9:1-5; Moffatt's translation). Thus, through three chapters of Romans (9-11), he wrestles with the problem, seeking now one,

now another, way out. There may be an election within the election, as in the past (9:6-13; 11:1-10). Anyway, God cannot do otherwise than right (9:14-33). If Israel does fail of the promise it will be her own fault (Chapter 10). But the Gentiles are not necessarily supplanting the Jews as heirs of the promise: rather it is to be expected that the coming in of the Gentiles will "provoke to jealousy" Paul's countrymen, so that they too will yet come in (11:11-32). No doubt from a logical point of view all this falls far short of carrying full conviction. Probably the several ideas which he throws out fall somewhat short of the mark even in his own thought. Yet his wrestling has not been in vain. Logic may prove inadequate; clear vision of what is to be may be denied; even so, at the end his faith in the national destiny is firm—an all but inseparable part of his trust in God. "For the gifts and the calling of God are not repented of . . . O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past tracing out!" (11:29, 33).

B. His Relations with the Mother Church at Jerusalem.

We have seen that the mother church, especially after the exodus which took place at the time of Stephen's death, was conservative (see above, Chap. XX). Its leaders shared in no small degree the general Jewish antipathy to Paul's practice of making little of the traditional barrier between Gentiles and the true people of God. Strained relations naturally resulted, the situation becoming particularly acute at Antioch. What happened is thus described in Acts: "And certain men came down from Judaea and taught the brethren saying, Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses ye cannot be saved" (15:1). This meant that in order for

non-Jews to become Christians they must first become Jews in the full formal sense. To accept the sacred writings—the Torah or Law—as containing inspired teachings and as pointing to Jesus as the Christ was not enough. The Torah prescribed certain rites which must be observed, and since the Exile circumcision had come to be regarded as the most important of these rites. To orthodox Jews it was the chief symbol of their religion —the indispensable badge of membership in the community of the chosen of God and in this as in most other respects such a Christian as James of Jerusalem remained an orthodox Jew.

Paul, on the other hand, took a position similar to that of the great Hebrew prophets of earlier centuries. To make a surgical operation the central thing in religion and morality was all wrong: what was needed was an *inner* obedience and purification—a "circumcision of the heart" (Rom. 2:28-29; cf. Jer. 4:4; 6:10). Hence while he did not oppose the continued observance of the rite by Jewish Christians, he did set himself in unyielding opposition to the view that it was a necessary gateway to Christianity in the case of non-Jews. He felt that the point was a vital one. Nothing less than the future of the new movement as a spiritual religion was involved: "Ye are severed from Christ, ye who would be justified by the Law. . . . For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith working through love" (Gal. 5:4, 6).

Acts tells us that when the trouble in the church at Antioch became acute a delegation from that church, with Paul and Barnabas at the head, journeyed to Jerusalem to attempt to get the matter straightened out (15:2). Paul himself has something to say about what is apparently this same mission (Gal. 2:1-10). From his account we gather that he was in fighting mood, and that on the main point at issue he came off victorious.

He says that as a result of the conference "James and Cephas and John, they who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision." This amounted to a victory for Paul in that the "pillar apostles" agreed to allow him to carry on his Gentile mission in his own way, but it was far from being a final solution of the problem, as events were yet to show.

At one point in particular the Jerusalem agreement was weak. It failed to provide an answer to the important question of how Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians, living in the same community, were to associate together in friendly fellowship. That they should so associate was self-evident. Their religion particularly emphasized the spirit and practice of brotherly love. But how was brotherly love between the two groups to be practiced when one group continued to adhere to a Law which set up a rigid social barrier between its members and the members of the other group? How were they to partake together of the Lord's supper—the special symbol of Christian fellowship—so long as Jewish Christians believed that to take food with non-Jews meant defilement in the sight of God? (Cf. Acts 10:28; 11:3; Dan. 1:8; Judith 12:1ff.; etc.) Perhaps in Jerusalem this problem seemed relatively remote. In a Christian community of mixed membership, like that at Antioch, it soon became present, pressing, inescapable.

Following his account of the conference in Jerusalem Paul tells of an incident which occurred later in connection with a visit which Peter made to Antioch. Peter had found Jewish Christians fraternizing with their Gentile brethren very much as if there was no troublesome dividing line. The taboo regarding table fellowship was being largely ignored. So much we may infer, reading between the lines of Paul's brief narrative (Gal. 2:11ff.).

This no doubt shocked Peter at first, but the spirit of fraternity appealed to his generous and impulsive nature and soon he too was eating with the uncircumcised. In time word reached Jerusalem of what was going on at Antioch and "certain came from James," whereupon Peter's attitude underwent an abrupt change. The natural assumption is that the messengers of James took Peter to task for his laxity in the observance of the Law. For them to do so—even for James to have sent them for this express purpose—would not have been a breach of the agreement reached with Paul at Jerusalem. The agreement had not covered this point. To concede the possibility of Gentiles becoming Christians without observing all the requirements of the Jewish Law was one thing; to connive at laxity in the observance of the Law by Jewish Christians was quite another. This was no doubt the point of view of James, and it is not hard to understand. But we can just as readily understand Paul's vexation at the turn events had taken, and our sympathies are likely to be on his side. Not only Peter but the other Jewish Christians at Antioch, even Barnabas, began straightway to separate themselves from their Gentile brethren, and from Paul's point of view the whole effect was very bad.

It is fortunate that records of this struggle within the ranks of the early church have been preserved to us. Had it not been so we could scarcely have realized how nearly the religious movement started by Jesus came to perishing through lack of vision and daring in its early leadership. Had James' point of view prevailed little headway could have been made in the non-Jewish world. As a sect of Jews whose members expected their founder to return as a heavenly deliverer Christianity might have survived for some generations, possibly for some centuries; but certainly there could have been no great future for it along those lines. The times were ripe for

a new religion, but a Judaized Christianity, after the Jerusalem model, was not the religion for which the times were ripe. Moreover it emphatically was not a religion which would truly have represented Jesus of Nazareth, and kept alive his spirit in the world. The Jerusalem leaders were sincere and it is not difficult to see their point of view, but to the present-day student of history it is clear that Paul had the better end of the argument. And he won. The struggle was bitter for a time, as we see in Galatians; the danger was serious. But when we turn to the literature of the second century we see that it has passed. The Jews have still to be combated outside the church, but the Judaizers within are little to be reckoned with.

It is one of the interesting paradoxes of Christian history that men who had been closely associated with Jesus during his lifetime should have seen the significance of his life and work only in a fashion so limited and inadequate, while the deeper and far more essentially true vision was left to one who had not known him in the flesh and who had been trained as a Pharisee. How great and notable Paul's vision was can be appreciated the better when we reflect that even to-day the majority of the church's membership cannot be said to have attained to it. Circumcision is a dead issue, and "unclean" food is largely so, but the same disposition to tie religion up with formulas and observances is with us yet.

Before leaving this topic reference should be made to another, very suggestive, phase of Paul's relation to the Jerusalem community. In a previous chapter we took note of his zeal in the work of collecting offerings among the Gentile churches for the brethren in Jerusalem at a time when they were in need. It was a work of philanthropy, but it had also a more specific motive back of it. To the Christian community at Corinth Paul writes that "your generosity, of which I am the agent, will

make men give thanks to God; for the service rendered by this fund does more than supply the wants of the saints [*i.e.* the Jerusalem Christians], it overflows with many a cry of thanks to God. This service shows what you are, it makes men praise God for the way you have come under the gospel of Christ which you confess, and for the generosity of your contributions to themselves and to all; they are drawn to you and pray for you, on account of the surpassing grace which God has shown to you" (2 Cor. 9:11-14). The gathering of this fund is referred to repeatedly in Paul's letters. It evidently was near his heart and had a large place in his activities for a considerable time. It may be that what he hoped it would accomplish in the way of cementing friendly relations between Gentile and Jewish Christians was not realized. His own work was soon to be cut short by his arrest, while the storm was already brewing which in a few years would sweep away alike the Christian and the Jewish population of Jerusalem. But in any case the fund had not been collected in vain. The records of its collection are a standing monument to a side of Paul's personality which is too readily overlooked. He was a fighter certainly, but love was not lacking among the weapons which he used. He was by nature fond of disputation, of logical demonstration, of argument, but he did not fail to realize that the showing of a Christ-like spirit is sometimes the most effective proof of the validity of one's Christianity.

C. His Relations with His Christian Associates.

As a rule Paul did not travel alone on his missionary expeditions. On the first journey Barnabas was his companion and fellow-worker throughout. John Mark, in the capacity of "attendant," also was with them for a time. On the second journey his closest associates were Silas, or Silvanus, and Timothy. The former, like Bar-

nabas and John Mark, had been a member of the mother church in Jerusalem. Timothy, on the other hand, was a young recruit from the Gentile world. Paul met him on his visit to Derbe and Lystra, became attached to him, and induced him to join his company. He was of half-Jewish blood (Acts 16:1). On the third journey Timothy still appears on the scene from time to time (Acts 19:22; 20:4; cf. 1 Cor. 4:17; 16:10). In connection with the extended stay at Ephesus we meet also with the name of Erastus as one of "them that ministered unto him" (Acts 19:22), and the names of "Gaius and Aristarchus, men of Macedonia, Paul's companions in travel" (Acts 19:29). Later, after the three months spent in Greece, we read that as Paul set out on the long return journey through Macedonia he was accompanied by "Sopater of Beroea, the son of Pyrrhus; and of the Thessalonians, Aristarchus and Secundus; and Gaius of Derbe, and Timothy; and of Asia, Tychicus and Trophimus" (Acts 20:4). The "we" of Acts 16:10 and after probably points to Luke, "the beloved physician" (Col. 4:14), as having been another of Paul's associates for fairly long periods. Still another was Titus. His name does not appear in Acts, but we meet with him in Paul's letter to the Galatians and frequently in 2 Corinthians. The names of Aquila and his wife Priscilla also belong on the list of temporary associates (Acts 18:2, 18). And there were such comrades and helpers as Tertius, who acted as Paul's secretary (Rom. 16:22), Lydia of Philippi, Jason of Thessalonica, and Titus Justus of Corinth, who welcomed him into their homes (Acts 16:14-15; 17:5-9; 18:7), not to mention others whom Paul, from references to them in his letters, evidently thought of as not only fellow-Christians and fellow-workers but as friends. It is evident that there was nothing of the recluse in Paul's temperament or in his conception of his Christian discipleship.

It would have been surprising if Paul's relations with his close associates had always been perfectly harmonious. His temperament was too positive for that. The author of Acts, whose general tendency is to smooth over differences of opinion rather than to exploit them, tells of a "sharp contention" which on one occasion arose between Paul and Barnabas—so sharp that they "parted asunder," each going his own way (15:36-40). Paul himself makes clear how warm his dispute was with Peter at Antioch. "I resisted him to the face," he says (Gal. 2:11).

But the heat which he not seldom displayed in conflict was surpassed by the warmth of his usual interest in, loyalty to, and affection for his associates. Between him and Timothy the bond seems to have been particularly close. Of this young lieutenant he says, writing to the church at Corinth: "He is a dear child of mine, in the service of the Lord, and one on whom you can depend" 1 Cor. 4:17; Goodspeed's translation). And to the church at Philippi: "I hope, with the help of the Lord Jesus, to send Timothy to you soon. . . . For I have no one like him, who would take such a real interest in you . . . you know his character, and how like a son helping his father he has worked like a slave with me in preaching the good news. So I hope to send him to you just as soon as I can see how my case is going to turn out" (Phil. 2:19-23; *ibid.*). In a letter to another friend and fellow-worker, Philemon, there is a characteristic note: "So although as a Christian I feel quite free to order you to do what ought to be done, I prefer to appeal to you in the name of love . . ." Philem. 8-9; *ibid.*). He was versatile in his use of methods, but it was the appeal in the name of love which he preferred.

How far he was above petty jealousy is seen in his handling of the trouble between different factions in the Corinthian church: "For when there are still jealousy

and quarrels among you, are you not worldly and living on a merely human level? For when one man says, 'I am a follower of Paul,' and another, 'I am a follower of Apollos,' are you not simply human? What is Apollos? Or what is Paul? Just servants through whom you came to have faith, as the Lord gave each of us opportunity. I did the planting, Apollos the watering, but it was God who made the plants grow" (1 Cor. 3:3-6;*ibid.*, cf. Phil. 1:15-18).

At this point a word may be said also about his relations with his converts, the rank and file of the membership of the Christian communities in which he worked. Having been originally their "father in Christ" he was henceforth their brother, friend, example, teacher, counselor. It was no light responsibility and he did not treat it as if it were. He poured his whole soul into it, giving to it, and to them, the best that he had and was. Undoubtedly what he gave them had different levels of value. Some of it has little or no value for the life of the Western world in the twentieth century, however well it may have been adapted to the immediate situation or need. But for the most part what has been preserved in his letters makes interesting and impressive reading, even in our distant age. It is not mere cut-and-dried ethics, inherited formulæ passed on; it is vividly alive. Yet it is not less remarkable for its balance, its realism, its common sense.

Paul was a mystic, as we have seen. Union with Christ was the foundation on which he urged his converts to build their lives. He himself, like some of them, had the gift of "speaking with tongues" (1 Cor. 14:18), was at times "beside himself" (2 Cor. 5:13), and gloried in such experiences of religious ecstasy (2 Cor. 12:1-5). Yet he was quite capable of giving counsel or orders that were sternly practical. "If any will not work, neither let him eat," was his dictum to the idling Thes-

salonians. He suggested to the obstreperous Corinthians that if those of their number who were "puffed up" did not mend their ways he might feel obliged to come to them "with a rod" instead of with his customary spirit of gentleness (1 Cor. 4:18-21). And while paying tribute to the value of religious ecstasy in its proper sphere he made it clear that in his judgment its sphere was limited —that Christians were making a great mistake when they regarded the gift of "tongues" as supreme among spiritual gifts. His words in this connection are notable: "I thank God, I speak with tongues more than you all: howbeit in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousands words in a tongue" (1 Cor. 14:18-19). It is a greater declaration than we are likely to realize. The idea that the divine spirit is manifested more truly and fittingly in the quietly useful than in wonder-inspiring spectacles which have little of helpfulness can scarcely be said to be a commonplace even in the advanced world in which we live. It was much less so in Paul's world.

It is in the midst of this discussion of "spiritual gifts" that we find what is doubtless the most widely known passage from Paul's pen—the thirteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians. Jesus, when asked what was the first commandment of all, had answered, in substance, one word, "love" (Mark 12:28-34). The question with which Paul was dealing was similar: What is the supreme expression of man's life with God? Some of his converts at Corinth were disposed to find the answer in such ecstatic experience as the gift of tongues. Paul's answer was to point not only to the value of speech in which the "understanding" had full play but also, with Jesus, to love as the *sine qua non*: "If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am become sounding brass, or a clanging cymbal. And if I have the gift of prophecy, and know all mysteries and all knowledge,

and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing. . . . Follow after love" (1 Cor. 13:1-2; 14:1).

D. His Relations with Roman Officialdom.

The author of Acts pictures Paul's contacts with officials of the Empire as prevailingly friendly, in marked contrast with the missionary's relations with his fellow-countrymen. We see him treated with courtesy and respect by Sergius Paulus (13:7, 12), and by Felix and Festus (24:22-23; 25:4-5), all of them provincial governors. Gallio, proconsul of the province of Achaia and brother of the philosopher Seneca, contemptuously dismisses the charge brought against him by his Jewish enemies (18:12-17). Imperial officials ("Asiarchs") at Ephesus are his "friends" and prove their friendship when danger threatens him (19:31). Julius the centurion, the officer in charge of the soldiers detailed to take Paul to Rome, shows remarkable kindness to his prisoner (27:3, 43). Similar treatment is received at the hands of local officials holding office under Roman authority; *e.g.* the "rulers of the city" at Thessalonica (17:5-9), the "townclerk" at Ephesus (19:37-38), and Publius, the "chief man" of Malta, who "entertained us three days courteously" (28:7-10). The narrative of Acts closes with Paul—technically a prisoner awaiting trial—living in a rented residence in Rome, preaching and teaching and receiving visitors without restraint. A soldier is with him as guard, and presumably he may not move freely abroad, but the imprisonment assuredly is not severe (28:16, 30-31).

It is quite possible that the author of Acts had special reasons for wanting to emphasize the friendly nature of Paul's contacts with representatives of the Empire. And if so we may with reason make allowance for a certain bias in his account. But the accuracy of the general pic-

ture we need scarcely doubt. Certain it is that Paul was loyal to the Empire and sought to inculcate loyalty. Writing to Christians in the capital he says: "Everyone must obey the authorities that are over him, for no authority can exist without the permission of God; the existing authorities have been established by him, so that anyone who resists the authorities sets himself in opposition to what God has ordained, and those who oppose him will bring down judgment upon themselves. The man who does right has nothing to fear from the magistrates, as the wrongdoer has. If you want to have no fear of the authorities, do right, and they will commend you for it, for they are God's agents to do you good. But if you do wrong you may well be afraid, for they do not carry swords for nothing. They are God's servants, to execute his wrath upon wrongdoers. You must obey them, therefore, not only to escape God's wrath, but as a matter of principle, just as you pay your taxes; they are God's ministers, devoting themselves to this service. Pay them all what is due them—tribute to the man entitled to receive it, taxes to the man entitled to receive them, respect to the man entitled to it, and honor to the man entitled to it" (Rom. 13:1-7, Goodspeed's translation).

Now it cannot be denied that this picture of the Roman machinery of government is highly idealized. The John of Revelation who wrote somewhat later, in Domitian's reign, would have vigorously opposed the proposition that "anyone who resists the authorities sets himself in opposition to what God has ordained." As he saw it one *must* resist the authorities in order to do what God had ordained. Even in Paul's time it certainly was not always or necessarily true that "the man who does right has nothing to fear from the magistrates." Doubtless it never has been, under any government. Yet we need not conclude that Paul was insincere and that he was

flattering the authorities for the purpose of currying favor with them. We have seen that he was by nature conservative in his attitude to those institutions which seemed to form the bulwarks of society, and he had learned by experience that his gospel of spiritual freedom could easily be taken as an excuse for social and political anarchy. He may well have had information as to turbulent tendencies among the Christians in Rome which led him to deem such an admonition as this to be pertinent. And, above all, we have every reason for assuming that he himself was proud of being a "Roman born" (Acts 22:28), proud of the Empire's great achievements in government and grateful for the order and stability within its bounds, without which his missionary activities would not have been possible. That it was a divine agency—its officials God's servants—was evidently his sincere belief.

Paul's genuine loyalty to and pride in the Empire, then, go far toward explaining his friendly contacts with its official representatives. If his father's family possessed wealth and prestige that would be another facilitating circumstance (cf. above, Chap. XXI). But beyond all this we must include in the reckoning the influence of an attractive, eager, outreaching personality. He was a thoroughly social being, with a natural aptitude for human contacts.

E. The Closing Years of Paul's Life.

Already in the twentieth chapter of Acts the reader is made to feel that the beginning of the end of Paul's life has come. On the last lap of the third missionary journey he stops at Miletus and sends for the elders of the church at Ephesus to meet him there. "When they came, he said to them, 'You know well enough how I lived among you all the time from the first day I set foot in Asia, and how I served the Lord most humbly and with

tears. . . . I am here now on my way to Jerusalem, for the Spirit compels me to go there, though I do not know what will happen to me there, except that in every town I visit, the holy Spirit warns me that imprisonment and persecution are awaiting me. But my life does not matter, if I can only finish my race and do the service intrusted to me by the Lord Jesus, of declaring the good news of God's favor. Now I know perfectly well that none of you among whom I went about preaching the Kingdom of God will ever see my face again . . . I commit you to the Lord . . .' With these words, he knelt down with them all and prayed. They all wept aloud, and throwing their arms about Paul's neck they kissed him affectionately, for they were especially saddened at his saying that they would never see his face again. Then they accompanied him to the ship" (Acts 20:18-38; Goodspeed's translation).

The story of the arrest in Jerusalem, the imprisonment and repeated hearings in Caesarea, and the subsequent journey to Rome is told with a good deal of detail in Acts. James, and the other leaders of the Jerusalem church, receive Paul and his party cordially. However, they have a warning, as well as a greeting, for him: "You see, brother, how many thousand believers there are among the Jews, all of them zealous upholders of the Law. They have been told that you teach all Jews who live among the heathen to turn away from Moses, and that you tell them not to circumcise their children nor to observe the old customs. What then? They will be sure to hear that you have come. So do what we tell you. We have four men here who are under a vow. Join them, undergo the rites of purification with them, and pay their expenses. . . . Then everybody will understand that there is no truth in the stories about you, but that you yourself observe the Law" (21:20-24; *ibid.*) Paul readily consents to the plan and undertakes to play his

part. A week passes, during which he has been attending to the rites incident to the fulfillment of the vow. The plan presumably has been successful, as far as Christian Jews are concerned, but trouble is brewing from another, all too familiar, source. "The seven days were almost over when the Jews from Asia caught sight of him in the Temple, and stirred up all the crowd and seized him, shouting, 'Men of Israel, help! This is the man who teaches everybody everywhere against our people and the Law and this place . . .' The whole city was thrown into confusion, and the people hurried together, and seized Paul . . ." (21:27-30; *ibid.*)

The Roman officer in command of the garrison at Jerusalem, who rescues Paul from the Jewish mob, finds the case an embarrassing one. For one thing he cannot find out what the man has done. That he is fiercely and fianatically hated is clear, but the officer tries in vain to learn what it is all about. He discovers only that it has to do with "questions about their Law," which mean nothing to him. Moreover it develops that his prisoner is a Roman citizen and a person of some prominence. He has him appear before the Sanhedrin. Here Paul declares himself to be a loyal Pharisee, whereupon some of the Pharisaic scribes show a disposition to take his side. A violent quarrel with the Sadducean element in the council ensues. Paul, in danger of being torn to pieces, is rescued by the Roman soldiers once more. Their commander has not found the proceedings very enlightening. When he is informed by Paul's nephew, a day or two later, that desperate Jews are plotting to kidnap and kill his prisoner he takes energetic action to get the troublesome affair off his hands. He gets Paul out of the city by night and sends him, under strong military guard, to the provincial capital at Caesarea.

Two of the incidents of these exciting days in Jerusalem are of particular interest—Paul's joining in the

Nazarite vow, and his proclaiming in the Sanhedrin that he is a Pharisee. In both cases his attitude may seem unworthy—a sacrifice of principle for expediency. But such a view is scarcely fair. After all, he *was* a Pharisee, and was proud to be so known (Phil. 3:3-5). If he deliberately sought to gain his own advantage through dividing his opponents we may note the fact as showing his ability to make use of "the wisdom of this world." It does not follow either that other Christians should or that they should not use the tactics which he used.

And neither need we assume that he was other than sincere in the matter of the vow. Notwithstanding his vigorous fight against the imposition on non-Christians of Jewish ritual, he himself in Jerusalem could with entire sincerity set about to prove his personal loyalty to that ritual. Yet the more fully we grant his sincerity the more clearly we must see that his attitude involved a real inconsistency. He too, though in far less measure than a leader like James, was trying to keep the new wine in old wineskins—to achieve an impossible synthesis of the mechanical and provincial with the spiritual and universal. We feel this often as we read his letters. He attempts, especially in Romans, to use the inherited religious mechanism in explaining and transmitting to others his own profound religious experience; and the reader is likely to feel often that the mechanism is a hindrance rather than a help. It is a characteristic of the letters which contributes to their perennial interest—and to the perennial dispute as to what Paul's outlook really was. In our own times he is made the mouthpiece for the setting forth of diametrically opposite conceptions of Christianity.

We need not dwell upon the events at Caesarea and on the way to Rome. The author of Acts continues to point out how his hero is the victim of unmerited Jewish hostility, Roman officials repeatedly failing to find any seri-

ous substance to the charges brought against him by his enemies. Two successive procurators, Felix and Festus, hear his case. Threatened with a third trial at Jerusalem, where he could expect only the worst, he takes his stand upon his rights as a Roman citizen and demands to be tried in the court of the emperor. The appeal is granted, but even yet the procurator, Festus, feels that the information against the prisoner is too meager to constitute an indictment such as he needs for submission to the higher court. Hence yet another hearing, this time in the presence of Agrippa II, who is of part Jewish blood and has the reputation of being well versed in Jewish affairs. At its close "the king rose, with the governor and Bernice and those who had sat with them, and after leaving the room, in talking the matter over together they said, 'This man has not done anything to deserve death or imprisonment.' 'He might have been set at liberty,' said Agrippa to Festus, 'if he had not appealed to the emperor'" (Acts 26:30-32; Goodspeed's translation). But the appeal has been made and granted, and the prisoner is sent under guard to Rome. The author of Acts, or someone whose diary he has, was himself present on the voyage, hence he is able to tell the story in detail. There is a shipwreck and other adventures, but at length the veteran missionary achieves his long cherished ambition —he reaches the world's metropolis. He is an "ambassador in bonds" (Eph. 6:20), but an ambassador of Christ he remains, and happily he is able to proceed with the carrying out of his mission in spite of the bonds.

How Paul's appeal to the emperor turned out and what followed the two years in Rome of which Acts tells (28:30) we do not know, The abrupt ending of Acts is baffling and has never been satisfactorily explained. An obvious suggestion is that the author brings his story up to the time of writing and stops because there is as yet nothing more to record. But there are weighty objec-

tions to fixing the date of the book as early as this view requires. Perhaps the original ending has been lost, but if so no trace of its existence has survived. As they stand the closing verses fail to offer even moderately conclusive evidence as to whether Paul, at the close of the two years, was tried and convicted, tried and acquitted, or allowed to go free without trial. The third alternative may be said to be a shade the more probable. If his Jewish enemies, for any reason, failed to appear at Rome to press the case it is natural to suppose that he would in time be released. And apparently they did not appear. There is evidence in Philippians and Philemon, both apparently written during the Roman residence, that he was optimistic about his chances of release (Phil. 1:27; 2:24; Philem. 22).

But though it may be made to seem probable that his life extended somewhat beyond the two-year Roman period, subsequent events cannot be sketched with any confidence. The so-called Pastoral Epistles (1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, and Titus) contain references to movements of Paul and his friends which cannot well be made to fit into the scheme of his life provided by Acts. If this material is directly from Paul's hand, and the references are therefore to be regarded as historical, they may be taken as evidence of later, otherwise unknown, activities. But they are not usually so taken by the most competent scholarship of today, for the reason that these epistles, as we have seen, seem to be the work of a later "Paulinist," who cannot be assumed to have had accurate knowledge of Paul's life (see 1 Tim. 3:1; 2 Tim. 4:9-22; Tit. 1:5; 3:12; cf. above, Chap. VI).

In the second and following centuries the belief became quite general in the church that Paul had visited Spain. We find it expressed in the Muratorian Fragment, written about 175 A. D., and frequently from the time of Eusebius on. If "the limit of the west," in 1 Clement 5, means

Spain the tradition goes back as far as the end of the first century. Nevertheless we can have no positive assurance of its accuracy. It may have no more substantial foundation than Paul's *plan* to visit Spain made before his arrest in Jerusalem (see Rom. 15:24, 28). This explanation commends itself the more if the reference in Clement is taken to mean Rome, not Spain.

Eusebius preserved and handed down a tradition to the effect that Paul suffered martyrdom, at about the same time as Peter, in Rome(*HE.* II, 25). Other writers of the early centuries elaborated the tradition in much detail, and modern writers have labored at the attempt to fix a date, usually in the persecution under Nero, for the great apostle's death. But the whole matter remains obscure. The death of Jesus is the best attested fact in the tradition about him that has come down to us, and early records give much information as to accompanying events. With Paul it is quite otherwise.

However, in the Prison Epistles we have matter that adds more to the rounding out of our picture of Paul than would have been contributed by the most fully substantiated records of the time and manner of his death. To the Philippians he writes: "As life means Christ to me, so death means gain. But then, if it is to be life here below, that means fruitful work. So—well, I cannot tell which to choose: I am in a dilemma between the two. My strong desire is to depart and be with Christ, for that is far the best. But for your sakes it is necessary that I should live on here below" (1:21-24). And again: "For his (Christ's) sake I have lost everything (I count it all the veriest refuse) in order to gain Christ and be found at death in him, possessing no legal righteousness of my own, but the righteousness of faith in Christ, the divine righteousness that rests on faith. I would know him in the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings, with my nature transformed to die as he died,

to see if I too can attain the resurrection from the dead" (3:8-11; Moffatt's translation).

The mystical and the practical—Christ and the great task: in the shadow of death these are still, as before, the dominant notes. There was an intellectual strain in his make-up beyond doubt, but it was not uppermost. His one supreme and permanent contribution to Christian doctrine—the insistence that the new religion was not a mechanical scheme but that its essence lay in an inner union of the believer with God in Christ—was a product rather of spiritual intuition and experience than of acute reasoning. Certainly it is not in his attempts at logical demonstration that we find him at his best.

Deeply religious on the one hand, with great energy and administrative ability on the other hand; mysticism, vision, imagination, mediated through an intelligent, eager, outreaching personality; the whole tempered by a strong ethical sense and an ingrained respect for the established order of things—some such a combination of qualities we see in Paul. It did not produce perfection, but it did produce a great man remarkably fitted to be a pioneer in the Christian enterprise in the first century. He was the first Christian whom we really know, in the sense of having moderately full information about his life and work, and it may be questioned whether, all things considered, we have known a greater since.

CHAPTER XXIII

NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY: AFTER PAUL

A. Sources.

In a sense there is no such thing as New Testament history after Paul. The five narrative books—the four Gospels and Acts—all have to do with the earlier period. We search the New Testament in vain for any account of how the Christian movement progressed in the years following Paul's enforced residence in Rome. Nor has anything beyond meager and often untrustworthy references come down to us in sources outside the New Testament.

Yet though the early literature is entirely lacking in any direct or conscious presentation of Christian history after Paul the modern student is not necessarily foredoomed to failure in his effort to learn something as to what was happening. Though records are lacking *reflections* are numerous. With the exception of Paul's letters all the writings of the New Testament are products of this post-Pauline period—roughly the last third of the first and first third of the second centuries. At least the reasons for judging them to have been written in this period seem conclusive to the majority of competent investigators. And to the list may be added a number of more or less contemporary writings not now contained in the New Testament, as 1 Clement, the Didache, and Barnabas. With regard to this entire output of early Christian literature it is to be remembered that the motives for its production were primarily practical. The

writers wrote because they wanted to serve some present need. The writings themselves usually reveal, more or less clearly, the situations which called them forth, and when we have detected the situation we are in possession of source material for the history of the particular time and locality.

This applies to the Gospels and Acts as well as to epistles and treatises. New Testament scholars now recognize that these historical books are historical in a two-fold sense. They have preserved for us information about Jesus and Paul, and about the beginnings of the Christian movement, which is invaluable; also incidentally they reflect in numerous passages what was being thought and said and done in the Christian circles in which the writers moved—at a time when both Jesus and Paul had passed away and the new religion was undergoing transforming experiences.

Such material cannot be expected to yield a full historical narrative. Many questions must remain unanswered and many gaps unfilled. To sketch events in chronological order is not possible, but following a topical method we may be able to catch worth-while glimpses of what was going on. In a measure we shall be traversing again the ground covered in Chapters V and VI. There we were dealing with the rise of the later (post-Pauline) writings of the New Testament, and the task was largely one of pointing out, as best we were able, the circumstances which called them forth. Here we shall have to do with the same circumstances but our interest in them will be different. Our concern in the earlier chapters was to find out how the New Testament books came to be: in the present chapter our concern will be to gain light on how the Christian movement was progressing in this obscure but important transition period.

It *was* a transition period. Rapid and significant changes were taking place. Evolution so marked as to

amount almost to revolution was going on. Probably this will stand out as the most striking aspect of this closing period of New Testament history.

B. Geography.

The geographical expansion of Christianity during the half century following Paul's death is in some measure reflected in the New Testament. During the earlier period, as we learn from Paul's letters and Acts, missionary work had been done in Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece, and Italy. Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Philippi, Corinth, and Rome are the cities which stand out with greatest prominence. Beyond the point where the story of Acts breaks off such geographical hints as are available point, first, to the eclipse of Palestine, and, second, to the increasing prominence of Asia Minor and Italy as strongholds of Christianity. These are the outstanding points.

The role of Palestine in Christian history after Paul was a declining—not to say insignificant—one. This was partly due to the course of political events, particularly to the collapse of the Jewish state as a result of attempted revolts against Rome. From sources outside the New Testament—especially Eusebius and Epiphanus—we glean a little information about how the Jerusalem Christians were affected by the great war which broke out in 66 A. D. We are told that some time before the struggle reached the walls of the capital city itself (probably in the latter part of 69 A. D.) they left the city in a body and made their way across the Jordan to a Peraean town called Pella, in a region to which the war was not likely to extend. According to Eusebius a divine revelation had dictated that this move should be made. Some time after the Romans took Jerusalem the Christian band is said to have returned. Such desertion in the face of the enemy naturally would not increase their popularity with

the Jews, and if they had had any chance of converting their own nation the chance was now forever lost. Following the next great rebellion, under Barcochba in 132-135 A. D., the emperor Hadrian drove all Jews out of Jerusalem and established there a Roman colony. Any Jew found in the city was to be put to death. The Christians who left at this time did not keep their organization intact, as they had done before. It is probable that some of them were absorbed into other Christian groups in the outside world, while others contributed to the formation of the heretical sect called the Ebionites, which continued in existence till the middle of the fifth century. From this time onward such churches as existed in Palestine seem to have been mainly of Gentile rather than Jewish membership. With the exception of the church at Caesarea—where Origen lived and labored in the third century and Eusebius in the fourth —they had little prominence.

But even aside from the political situation it was inevitable that conservative Jewish Christianity should decline in prestige as the movement spread and became increasingly acclimatized in the Gentile world. Paul himself—loyal Jew though he was and deferential in his attitude toward the mother church—vehemently repudiated the strongly Jewish brand of Christianity emanating from Jerusalem which he sometimes encountered in his work, and made it clear that there were limits to the amount of supervision which he would tolerate. And as the primitive missionary era passed, and Gentiles took the place of Jews in positions of leadership, it was natural that Palestinian overlordship should increasingly be repudiated or ignored.

Apparently not a single book in the New Testament, whether Pauline or post-Pauline, was written in Palestine or with Palestinian Jews or Christians particularly in view. This fact in itself illustrates strikingly how quickly

Christianity became transplanted from the land of its birth. It is possible, but not probable, that the Epistle of James was written by James of Jerusalem. We have seen that its atmosphere is rather that of some Gentile Christian circle around the close of the first century (cf. Chap. VI). Hebrews and Matthew have been widely supposed to have been written with Palestinian readers in view. Both are saturated with the Old Testament, but this does not prove the point. From the first Christian preachers and teachers availed themselves of the Jewish sacred books in proclaiming the gospel outside of Palestine—to non-Jews as well as to Jews. Familiarity with these Scriptures on the part of Gentiles was more widespread than is generally supposed.

There is a great deal that is Jewish throughout New Testament literature. Matthew and Hebrews may both have been written by Jewish authors, as Mark apparently was. Indeed Luke and Acts are the only writings in the collection which can be said with some certainty *not* to have been written by Jews. It is probable, also, that there are fragments of matter of Palestinian origin embedded in several of the books, *e.g.* in Matthew, Luke, Acts, and Revelation. Nevertheless a study of any one of these books will strongly if not conclusively suggest that it was intended to serve groups outside of Palestine. Thus the New Testament bears indirect witness to the rapidity with which the geography of Christianity shifted within a generation or two after its birth.

Rome, as we know, was destined to supplant Jerusalem as the Christian capital, and the early stage of this transition is reflected in the New Testament. When or by whom the new religion was carried to Italy we do not know, but it was firmly established long before Paul arrived there a prisoner. Several years earlier he had written to the Roman Christians of his joy that their faith was "proclaimed throughout the whole world"

(Rom. 1:8). Interesting suggestions as to progress in the later decades of the century may be gleaned from Hebrews, 1 Peter, and the epistle—known to us as 1 Clement—which the church of Rome addressed to the church at Corinth about 95 A. D. The writer of Hebrews, writing apparently to strengthen the Roman church against imminent persecution, incidentally chides it for remaining at an elementary stage of development "when by reason of the time ye ought to be teachers" (5:12). It may be, as suggested above (Chap. VI) that 1 Peter is an answer to this challenge. At any rate it appears to emanate from Rome and its writer undertakes to instruct Christians of Asia Minor as to their proper attitude on certain specific points. 1 Clement, again, written some years after Hebrews and 1 Peter, reveals the Roman church in an attempt to straighten out a church quarrel at Corinth. We may recall, finally, that the earliest of the Gospels was a product of the Roman church, if the tradition as to Mark's origin is correct, and that the author of Acts, writing late in the first century, brings his hero to Rome and then lays down his pen.

As to Asia Minor, it is clear that Paul's work in this region continued to bear fruit in later decades. The address of 1 Peter embraces the provinces of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia—almost the entire peninsula. The Book of Revelation, again, has Christians of Asia Minor in view. Seven cities—Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea—are specifically listed and addressed in the opening chapters. The evidence for connecting the Fourth Gospel and the three Johannine epistles with this same region is less explicit, being derived from the thought atmosphere of the writings themselves and from church tradition, but it is usually accepted as valid. Two other towns mentioned by Ignatius—Magnesia and Tralles—must also have had Christian communities

before the close of the first century. Doubtless there were many more. From Pliny's letters, inscriptions, and other sources we know that Christian missionary effort was more rapidly and completely successful here than anywhere else. By the end of the third century Asia Minor could be called a Christian country, and in the fourth and fifth centuries it produced leaders who were destined to rank among the fathers of the universal church. This takes us outside the bounds of New Testament history, but the point is that this later prominence is already forecasted in the New Testament.

Of progress in other regions the New Testament has only occasional hints. From the epistle to the Philippians we know that the church at Philippi was flourishing at the time when Paul's career was nearing its close. 1 Clement, as we have seen, bears witness to the existence of the church at Corinth toward the close of the first century, and also to the fact that it was torn with internal strife as it had been in Paul's time. But it would appear that on the whole the great apostle's labors in Macedonia and Greece did not prove very fruitful in after years. We hear of no such strong and aggressive churches in the Balkan peninsula as in Asia Minor in after centuries.

The mention of Crete in Titus 1:5 and of Dalmatia in 2 Tim. 4:10 serve to remind us that Acts is not to be taken as a complete record of the missionary advance in the first century. Paul, as we happen to know from his letters, had visited Arabia (Gal. 1:17) and had planned to visit Spain (Rom. 15:28)—a plan which he may possibly have carried out. Indeed the New Testament as a whole is far from being a geographical textbook of the early progress of Christianity. Yet it is worth while to note, as we have been doing here, that it does indicate the main lines of progress and forecast the advance to be made in following centuries. The only conspicuous

exception is the case of Egypt. In this country we find Christianity firmly established in the second century. In all probability it had been planted there before the close of the New Testament period, but the New Testament writings yield no information on the subject, direct or indirect.

C. Changing Relations with the Empire.

There are many contrasts in the New Testament, but none is more striking than that between Paul's attitude toward the Roman government, and the attitude of the "John" who wrote Revelation (cf. above, Chaps. VI, XXII). To Paul the existing authorities have been established by God, so that resisting them means resisting God. Moreover there is no need to oppose them, since they are on the side of right and a terror only to wrongdoers. Not only are taxes to be paid, but respect, honor, and obedience are to be rendered to the magistrates who represent the government (Rom. 13:1-7). To John, on the other hand, Rome (or "Babylon," as he chooses to call it) stands for something very different. Rome is "the mother of the harlots and the abominations of the earth" (Rev. 17:5), and a great deal else that is not complimentary. He sees her downfall as imminent, and he celebrates it in a paean of triumph (18). As to Christians obeying what Rome might choose to command, "If any man worshipeth the beast and his image, and receiveth a mark on his forehead, or upon his hand, he also shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is prepared unmixed in the cup of his anger; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment goeth up for ever and ever; and they have no rest day and night . . ." (14:9-11).

No doubt differences in temperament, and different kinds of personal contacts with Roman officials, had

something to do with the contrasted attitudes, but the passage last quoted reveals a deeper and more serious reason. In Paul's time Christian loyalty to the government was not put to the test of willingness to worship the emperor as a deity. If it had been we can scarcely imagine that Paul would have either practiced or enjoined obedience. In the Christian circles of Asia Minor to which John belonged and for which he wrote this demand had already been made and their refusal to comply had cost many Christians their lives. John himself had suffered banishment and in exile wrote the burning denunciations which we read in his book.

Whether John's attitude was shared by a large proportion of the Christian leaders of his time (Domitian's reign, 81-96 A. D.) we cannot say. Certainly it was not shared by all. The author of 1 Peter, as we have seen, can still enjoin submission to king and governors. He can still ask, in the spirit of Paul, "Who is he that will harm you, if ye be zealous of that which is good?" (2:13-14; 3:13). He was writing from Rome, apparently, and perhaps did not realize how serious the situation in Asia Minor had become.

The Book of Revelation may be said to mark the beginning of the long struggle between Christianity and the Empire—a struggle which culminated when, several centuries later, adherents of the new religion came into control of the machinery of government.

D. Changing Attitude Toward Judaism and the Jews.

Almost at the end of his missionary career we find Paul, in the great passage Romans 9-11, wrestling with the

[1] There are apparent reflections of the earlier persecution in Nero's reign (64 A.D.) in several New Testament passages, *e.g.* Heb. 10:32-34; *cf.* Rev. 13:3, 17:8. Some scholars hold that this persecution, rather than that under Domitian, is reflected in 1 Peter.

question of the relation of the Jews to God's new revelation in Jesus Christ (cf. above, Chap. XXII). His countrymen have rejected the revelation: Will God then cast them off? Paul, who has not lost his pride of race, cannot believe that He will. They have deserved it, but "the gifts and the calling of God are not repented of." Thus the matter looked to a Jewish Christian leader as the first generation of Christians was passing from the scene. Nor did the expectation that the Jews as a nation would be converted to Christianity and restored to power perish with Paul. It has been voiced from time to time through all the succeeding centuries. Few, however, have taken the matter as seriously as Paul did. To Christians in general a simpler answer to the question of God's plan and purpose has seemed to lie at hand. The Old Testament promises hold, but it is in Christianity, not in Judaism, that they are to be fulfilled. The gifts and the calling of God are not repented of, but they may be transferred when those who originally received them proved faithless to the trust. The Jews, as God's chosen people, have been indeed cast off. The church has succeeded to temple and synagogue.

What we have to note here is that this point of view obtains already in the later writings of the New Testament. Probably the fall of Jerusalem, in 70 A. D., gave impetus to it. Since the Jewish nation was overthrown, while Christianity was making rapid progress in the Gentile world, it was obvious that God must have willed it so. We can see how the Gospel writers have been influenced by this conviction in their selection of materials and in their manner of presenting them. Mark raises the question as to why Jesus spoke so much in parables, and the answer which he understands Jesus to have given is rather far from what we would expect. The reason given is not that the story method is at once the most natural method for him and the most effective method of con-

veying his ideas to those who listened to him. Quite the contrary. The purpose—as far as Jesus' Jewish hearers in general are concerned—is not to reveal but to conceal. Only to a small group of his followers does he give the key to the meaning of his parables. "Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all things are done in parables: that seeing they may see and not perceive; and hearing they may hear and not understand; lest haply they should turn again, and it should be forgiven them" (Mark 4:11-12). In short, the very form of their Master's teachings seemed to his followers a generation after his death to be evidence of God's having cast off the Jewish nation and transferred its privileges to the Christian church, now largely of Gentile membership.

The latter part of the quotation from Mark is taken from a passage in Isaiah (6:9-10) which we find used over and over again in the New Testament. Both Matthew and Luke follow Mark in using it, Luke making less of it, Matthew more, than Mark does. Acts represents Paul as quoting the passage to the Jews in Rome, after a not very successful attempt to convince them of Jesus' Messiahship, and following it with the declaration that now "this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles; and *they* will hearken (Acts 28:26-28). The Fourth Gospel, using the matter from Isaiah in a different connection from that of the Synoptics, prefixes it with the statement that "For this cause they *could not* believe, for that Isaiah said," etc. (John 12:39-40).

The author of Acts understands the divine plan to have been that the good news about Jesus should be given first to the Jews, and he is at pains to point out how this obligation was faithfully carried out by the early Christian missionaries. Peter says to the Jeruslaem Jews: "Unto you first God, having raised up his Servant, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from

your iniquities" (Acts 3:26). In like manner Paul and his fellow-workers, in the Gentile cities, are represented as seeking out first the Jewish inhabitants. But invariably the wider reach of the plan—involving the rejection of the Jews and the transfer of their ancient privileges to a new, largely Gentile, group—was revealed in the course of events. Thus at Pisidian Antioch, following a disturbance raised by the Jews in the synagogue, "Paul and Barnabas spoke out boldly, and said, It was necessary that the word of God should first be spoken to you. Seeing ye thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo we turn to the Gentiles" (13:46).

It would seem that in such passages as this and 28:26-28, cited above, Paul's attitude is pictured in a way which has taken color somewhat from the prevailing point of view at the later date when Acts was composed. Certainly Romans 9-11 does not reflect this point of view. Here he explains to his non-Jewish readers that "a hardening in part hath befallen Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and so all Israel shall be saved" (11:25-26). It was the logic of later events which led to the different outlook of the Gospels and Acts.

But the new church did not break with Judaism when it broke with the Jews—not nearly so decisively, at any rate. Certain rites—notably circumcision, which was very repugnant to Gentiles—were left behind. Paul's fight on this point, so vividly reflected in Galatians, was won definitely and finally. But in the main the religion of the Jews was taken over by the Christians, who regarded it as their divinely given heritage. Two elements, in this heritage, were of especial significance—the Jewish Scriptures and the Jewish eschatology.

Matthew, which may fairly be called the most anti-Jewish of the Synoptic Gospels, is at the same time the one which makes largest use of the Jewish Scriptures.

The author makes a great deal of Jesus' invective against the most admired and trusted Jewish leaders, the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. 23), while constantly appealing to the Jewish sacred writings for substantiation of what he has to say about Jesus. Of course this is logical enough, in view of the Christian claim that God's revelation to the Jews held good but had been transferred from the Jews to themselves. Hebrews and Revelation vie with Matthew in the large use made of Old Testament materials, and others of the New Testament writings do not lag far behind. Many passages in the Old Jewish writings could be made, with real aptness, to point toward Jesus and the Christian movement, and numerous others which were less apt were understood as predictive by the uncritical writers and readers of the early Christian books. The use of these ancient materials strengthened the new religion by giving it something of the flavor of antiquity. And by and by it led to the demand for, and fashioning of, a new body of Scriptures—distinctively Christian—to be placed beside the old (cf. above, Chap. VII).

It will be seen that what the later books of the New Testament reflect in this matter is simply a further development of what was already present in the writings of Paul. The difference is mainly that in such writings as Matthew and Hebrews the use of Old Testament matter is more formal and labored and less spontaneous than what we usually find in Paul. The religion which took its start from Jesus, who left nothing in writing, was to go down through the centuries as a "religion of a book," and the greater part of the Book was to consist of the Scriptures of the Jews—to all of which there were to be consequences both for better and for worse.

The Jewish outlook toward the future, with certain necessary modifications, also was retained. The present evil "age" would come to a sudden and violent end and

a new age, prepared by God himself, would be ushered in (cf. above, Chap. XIII). Christ, returning to earth, would usher it in. This central role assigned to Christ—that is, to him whom the Christians accepted but the Jews did not accept as the Anointed One—was of course one outstanding modification in the Jewish scheme. It was a modification which had been made at the very first, and which we find prominent in Paul's thought.

Another important adaptation, having to do with the *time* of the transition from the old to the new order, came more slowly. The Jewish hope itself had fluctuated on this point, yet none of the seers who voiced the hope thought of the change as remote. On the contrary they thought of it as relatively near. Their interest in it was not that of speculative philosophers, but of men who were suffering and who saw others around them suffering, and who looked for relief from present ills. Some, as the author of Daniel, had the time figured out quite definitely. And in general this view that the end of the present age was near at hand and would come as a relief from present ills remained the Christian view through nearly the whole of the New Testament period. It is affirmed in the Synoptic Gospels (Mark 13:30 and parallels) and with much earnestness and vehemence in Revelation (1:1, 3; 22:20; etc.). But as we know this view was destined to change. The expectation of Christ's return, and the ushering in of the new order, was by and by to be projected into the more remote future, at least as far as the thought of the great majority of Christians was concerned. And we have here to note that signs of this changing outlook are present already in the later strata of the New Testament. The evidence of 2 Peter is of particular interest. In this writer's time the hope has been so often and so long deferred that some are disposed to scoff at it—a tendency which the writer himself combats with vigor. He insists that the time has

not been long, as God counts time, and that in view of their unpreparedness his readers should be thankful for the delay. When he is least expected the Lord will come. "Wherefore . . . give diligence that ye may be found in peace, without spot and blameless in his sight" (2 Pet. 3:14; cf. above, Chap. VI. Of the Fourth Gospel's outlook we shall speak a little farther on).

Thus already at the close of the New Testament period we see forecasted the place which Christianity was to find for Jewish eschatology in its scheme of things. It was not a vitally important place. At best the certainty of Christ's return, with accompanying judgment, can scarcely be made as definite and obvious—to him who needs his moral backbone stiffened in this way—as is the certainty that he himself, before many years have passed, must die. And if the certainty of death does not move him to live a good life he will scarcely be moved more effectively by the expectation of the speedy end of things. For the first generation of Christians the Jewish hope had real value. It served as a convenient thought mold for their conviction that their Master still lived, that his work for humanity had not been finished in his earthly life but had merely been begun, and that the future lay with him. Perhaps to many it still has this value, but on the whole it would seem that its persistence in our time is a hindrance rather than a help.

E. Changing Social Outlook and Religious Emphasis.

An incidental remark of Paul's, in one of his letters to the Christians at Corinth, throws light on the social and cultural status of this community. He says, "Why, look at your own ranks, my brothers; not many wise men (that is, judged by human standards), not many leading men, not many of good birth, have been called!" (1 Cor. 1:26; Moffatt's translation). The description would probably have applied as well to the membership of any

of the other churches in Paul's time. How rapidly did the situation change? Were the upper classes better represented in the latter part of the New Testament period?

Somewhat better represented probably, but not a great deal. We recall that Luke addressed his Gospel to the "most excellent" Theophilus (a title indicating rank), and began it after the fashion of formal literary treatises of the time; that the very first verse of the Fourth Gospel shows a blending of ideas characteristic of Stoic and Alexandrian-Jewish philosophy; that the Christian brethren addressed in James include rich men as well as those of low degree (Jas. 1:9-11; 2:1-9; 4:13-14). This probably indicates some advance since Paul's time, when occasional converts were made from the influential classes, as Erastus, city treasurer of Corinth (Rom. 16:23), Sergius Paulus, proconsul of Cyprus (Acts 13:6-12), Dionysius the Areopagite (Acts 17:34), and some "prominent women" of Thessalonica and Beroea (Acts 17:4, 12). But the change had not been great. It was not until later, when the new religion had won sufficient prestige to begin to be "respectable" that the upper classes, in large numbers, became allied with it. We find the Christian apologists of the second century admitting that their membership is composed mainly of slaves, freedmen, and laborers. No doubt the original readers of Luke's Gospel found, and were intended by the author to find, personal comfort in the beatitude, "Blessed are ye poor" (Luke 6:20).

When we turn from the question of economic and cultural status to that of social organization the evidence of change becomes clearer. In Paul's time such church organization as existed was very simple and elementary. The church at Corinth, for example, seems to have had no formally appointed or elected officers. If there had been such officials Paul surely would have referred to

them in his letters to that church—letters which have to do so largely with problems of internal administration. Instead we have merely a hint of an informal sort of government, in the injunction to "be in subjection to" such men as Stephanas "and to every one that helpeth in the work and laboreth" (1 Cor. 16:15-16) and in the statement that "God has set people within the church to be first of all apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers . . ." (12:28). The Thessalonian Christians, in like manner, are enjoined to esteem "for their work's sake" those who "labor among you and are over you in the Lord" (1 Thess. 5:12-13).

But already in one of the latest of Paul's letters we have an indication that the organization of the Christian groups is becoming more formal and more complex. In writing to the church at Philippi he addresses not only the "saints" (*i.e.* members of the church) in general but, by specific mention, their "bishops and deacons" (Phil. 1:1). At about the same time, or not long after, the "elders" (or presbyters) begin to emerge (cf. Acts 20:17, 28; 1 Clement 44, 54). At this period bishops and presbyters seem to be the same persons (though it is possible that by "presbyters" is meant simply the older men of the congregation, from whom the "bishops" are taken), and we find the terms used only in the plural. We gather that a typical Christian congregation had at its head not a single functionary but a number of presbyter-bishops of equal rank, with a group of deacons as their assistants. But in some communities before the close of the New Testament period a further development is to be seen. There is a single bishop, apparently, a body of presbyters, and another body of deacons. This seems to be the situation reflected in 1 Timothy and Titus; it is very clearly present in the letters of Ignatius, himself bishop of Antioch, written in 110-117.

Back of this development in organization is to be seen

a changing social outlook of great significance. In the period of Paul's earlier letters formal organization seemed unnecessary, for the reason that in each Christian group the divine Spirit was present "dividing to each one severally even as he will." The various types of function and service were thus provided for—apostle, prophet, teacher, etc. (cf. 1 Cor. 12:4-11, 28-30; 14:26-33). But even in Paul's time this system, or lack of system, was proving unworkable. The more spectacular "gifts" of the Spirit were being exalted at the expense of the more substantial and helpful types of service, order was sadly lacking, and the Christian virtue of love was all too little in evidence. All this appears plainly from Paul's lengthy discussion in 1 Cor. 12-14. Gradually, as emotional enthusiasm subsided and as the Christian communities saw themselves more as a part of the permanent order of things, community organization emerged; and thus were laid foundations of church government which were to endure through many centuries.

And parallel with the development in organization we note a change in religious emphasis. In general it is a change from the informal, spontaneous, and personal to the formal, regulated, and official. Appeal is now made to the written word, or to beliefs that have become standardized, rather than to the spontaneous oral utterance of inspired local teachers and prophets. The written word is found in the inherited Jewish Scriptures supplemented increasingly, as time goes on, by original Christian materials, particularly collected sayings of Jesus and incidents from his life. In earlier days originality of thought and interpretation was deemed a virtue. Jesus had said that the true scribe of the Kingdom would make use of things new as well as things old, and in the Pauline churches it was assumed that any Christian might be the Spirit's mouthpiece. But practical considerations were now leading to a different view. In the later epistles the

important thing is not for the individual to think freely, under the Spirit's guidance, but for him to think rightly —to be orthodox—which means for him to think as the majority of the group decide that he should think.

The strong emphasis on right conduct continues, but here too we note a difference when we compare the later New Testament epistles with those of Paul. With Paul the *religious* basis of ethics is constantly emphasized: it is from union with Christ, possession by the Spirit, that right conduct proceeds. There is a mysticism, a spiritual warmth, about his appeals to do right; they often make contact with one's emotional nature even when couched in an argumentative form that makes little appeal to the intellect. In such writings as James, Jude, and 2 Peter, on the other hand, the tone is very different, and the difference is not due entirely to the personal equation: Christianity, both for better and for worse, has become less mystical and "spiritual," more settled and sober.

In all these changes the practical motive was uppermost. The new religion was trying to establish itself in communities that were always wicked, by its standard, and often hostile—communities, moreover, with social and religious customs and traditions of their own which could not be ignored. It developed its government, practices, teachings—in large measure unconsciously—in such ways as would fit it to survive and work out its mission in such an environment.

F. Changing Thought of Christ and His Work.

Of particular interest is the development in the thought of Christians about their Master and his work. We find Mark calling attention to the greatness and glory of Jesus' earthly life, showing that Paul's view of it as a state of humiliation was far from being its only aspect. It was inevitable that Jesus should sooner or later be presented in this light to a world which delighted to

honor heroes and demigods. We find the authors of the next two Gospels attempting to do fuller justice to the divine side of Jesus' nature by making use of stories about his birth which had become current in some of the Christian communities. Mark had seemed to date his divine sonship only from his baptism by John, when he was already a mature man ready to begin his life work; these stories voice the belief that he was revealed as God's Son even in the manner of his conception and birth. Paul had already taught Jesus' preëxistence, thinking of him as "existing in the form of God" before his earthly life (Phil. 2:6-8), but there is no evidence that the stories used by Matthew and Luke were influenced by Paul in this. The two views—that of preëxistence with God and that of divine conception—seem to have arisen independently. The former gave philosophical, the latter popular, expression to the assurance of Christians that their Master had come from God and that his nature was like God's. Later Christian thought was to fit the two together, using the birth stories as a connecting link between the preëxistent life and the earthly life and ministry. At the time of their origin both were well fitted to make the figure of the Founder of Christianity greater and more significant to the world in which his followers found themselves.

In the case of Hebrews the practical motive back of the development of Christology is more than usually obvious. The Christians for whom the epistle is written have already suffered one severe persecution, and another is imminent. Will they hold fast? The writer believes that if they can be made to see the superlative greatness of their Master's person and work as he sees it they will. With great skill and eloquence he tries to make them sharers of his view. "Having then a great high priest, who hath passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of

God, let us hold fast our confession" (4:14). This is the keynote of what he has to say. His thought is obviously akin to Paul's, yet in developing the idea of Christ's priesthood he follows lines of his own.

But in Asia Minor and other regions of the East there was an even greater danger than that Christians would not think highly enough of their Lord to confess his name in the face of death. The danger was that their thought of him would go so far afield in philosophical and mystical speculation as to lose contact both with the facts of history and with the obligations of daily life. This was the tendency of that widespread mode of religious thought to which the name "Gnostic" is applied, and it is evident that in some communities Christianity was being influenced by Gnosticism before the close of the period covered by the New Testament. Paul, naturally enough, was regarded as the patron saint of the movement, but as far as we can judge its philosophico-mystical speculations too often lacked the leaven of common sense and healthy morals which they had in the case of Paul. Christians with Gnostic leanings tended to interpret much of Jesus' earthly life as having been mere appearance (since surely God could not in fact be thus limited) and to understand his great work to have been the bringing to earth of some mysterious wisdom or light which would solve life's problems for those who were so fortunate, through initiation, as to partake of its benefits.

It is in John and 1 John, more than any other New Testament books, that these Gnostic views are reflected. At some points the author of the Fourth Gospel throws himself open to the suspicion of being a Gnostic Christian himself: he makes so much use of such abstract terms as life, light, truth, knowledge, and the great figure whom he portrays is so constantly superior to the limitations of ordinary humanity. Nevertheless both Gospel

and epistle insist that Christ really came in the flesh, while the writer of the Gospel is at pains to relate details of Jesus' life and death which show that both life and death were real, not mere appearances. This Gospel is in fact a remarkable attempt to effect a harmonious blending of the historical and the mystical strains in Christianity—to save for the new religion both its Jesus of history and its Christ of religious experience. And the success of the attempt is attested by the popularity which the book achieved, the enormous influence which it came to wield. Gnosticism continued to be a strong force in Christianity until well on in the second century, but already in these New Testament books, with their emphasis on both the human and the divine in Jesus, we see the main features of the Christology which the church was to evolve in answer to the Gnostic challenge.

There was being evolved also a new doctrine of salvation—a new conception of what Christ was to do for his followers. To the author of the Fourth Gospel the Two Ages idea, inherited from Judaism, has very little meaning or reality. He does not look forward to a spectacular future Return: the presence of the Spirit is the real fulfillment of the Master's promise to come to his followers. His outlook thus is more thoroughly mystical than that of Paul and much more so than that of the original circle in Jerusalem. As over against the earlier view that the benefits of Christ's saving work can be fully enjoyed only in a future state, after the present system of things has been completely overthrown, he "maintains that life in its full reality is communicated here and now" (Scott, *The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology*, p. 247). His view, in fact, was too mystical for general acceptance. The influence of his book, great as it was, did not suffice to cause Christianity to throw off its allegiance to Jewish eschatology.

The question naturally arises as to just what constitutes the "life" given by Christ to his followers. The author has a twofold answer. He is a philosopher, and from this point of view he answers that it is something essentially different from what men ordinarily call life. It is divine energy, existence on a superhuman plane. Christ only can communicate it, because Christ himself is uniquely one with God. But when the author gives voice to his religious experience rather than to his speculative thought the answer is different. He presents Christ as communicating himself in the ethical and spiritual rather than the metaphysical sense; as giving his spirit, his outlook, his religious and moral personality.

There is also the question of *how* the life is communicated. This Gospel's answer is through belief in Christ and mystical union of one's life with him. About both of these means of communication a great deal is said, and it cannot be denied that much of it seems to be on a lower level than the thought of Paul. The "belief" often appears to be merely intellectual assent to the proposition that Jesus was and is what he is claimed to be, while the union with Christ seems to be not only mystical but semi-physical—sometimes involving a belief in the magical efficacy of the Christian sacraments. There is room for surprise that this element in the Gospel's thought does not stand in the way of its helpfulness to modern readers more than it actually does. The reason is not far to seek. Like Paul the author is too great a figure; his religious experience has been too profound, his moral personality is too sincere and vigorous, to permit what he says to be dominated by the thought-forms through which his spirit speaks. The union with Christ of which he speaks is obviously a reality to him, and the reader is likely to feel that it must be a very much worthwhile reality.

How prophetic this Johannine doctrine of salvation was scarcely needs to be pointed out. Its tendency to pass from religious mysticism to dogma and magic has gone with Christianity through all its history. And happily, in Christian history as in the Gospel, the religion of the spirit has steadfastly refused to be submerged.

CHAPTER XXIV

NEW TESTAMENT RELIGION: A SUMMARY

A. The Religion of Jesus and Paul

There is no simple or single answer to the question of what makes the New Testament a great book: what has given it its place in world literature, in religious history, and in the hearts and lives of men. But undoubtedly one of the most important elements in the answer is the fact of the great personalities which the New Testament reveals, and of these personalities two—Jesus and Paul—tower immeasurably above all the rest. It is really these two great figures which *make* the New Testament. And both are above all things else religious personalities. They are men to whom religious experience is not one of the side issues of life: it is absorbing, overwhelming, all-embracing; it is life itself.

In some respects the two were very different. Paul was a city man, an aristocrat, a traveler. He had enjoyed the benefits of higher education, and was a professional theologian. Jesus was of plebeian stock, village born, a man of the hills. His formal education was only elementary, the range of his travels very narrow, and the work for which he was trained seems to have been that of an artisan. Paul lived and worked for a score or more of years after the call to a special religious mission had come to him, while Jesus had a very much shorter period in which to make his impress on the world—not more than two or three years, perhaps not so long. In Paul's case the call came as part of a revolutionary inner experience which amounted to a reversal of much of his previous outlook on religion and on life. With Jesus, again,

it was quite otherwise. The inner experience which accompanied his call was a unifying and focusing of the previous currents of his life rather than a turning back of the stream into new courses. And in line with this is the further fact that we do not detect in Jesus that sense of personal sin which is so vividly expressed by Paul. Paul's cry, "Wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?" would not sound natural from Jesus' lips.

When we attempt to carry the contrast farther, increasing caution is required. It may seem, for example, that while Paul is excitable, combative, partisan, Jesus moves on a plane above human passions and partisanships; but upon further study one is likely to conclude that this distinction is less sharp than he had thought at first. Calmness and suavity are by no means entirely lacking in Paul's letters, and the Jesus who rebuked Peter, denounced the hypocritical Pharisees, and drove the money-changers out of the temple was not a stranger to the passions which lead men to fight for that to which their affections and loyalty are attached. He whose ideal man is passionless, like the Stoic "wise man," will not find his ideal exemplified in either of the two great figures of the New Testament.

Another contrast which should not be accepted without careful consideration is that between Jesus the social revolutionist and Paul the reactionary conservative in social matters. Here as elsewhere it is all too easy to read one's own outlook and preferences back into primitive Christian history. It would be nearer the truth to say that both Jesus and Paul were conservative in their attitude toward existing social institutions, but that some elements in the teaching of both, if carried to their logical conclusion in their day or in ours, would have revolutionary effects. We have met with illustrations of Paul's conservatism in preceding chapters. It is not entirely

unfair to him to cite him as a supporter of slavery, since he advised slaves against seeking their freedom (1 Cor. 7: 20-24), yet it is clear that the institution of slavery would not survive long after the brotherly relationship between master and slave which Paul counseled in his letter to Philemon was put into general practice. The conservatism of Jesus appears in such sayings as "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's" (Mark 12:17), "The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses' seat: all things therefore whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe" (Matt. 23:2-3), "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy but to fulfill" (Matt. 5:17). There is also the fact that in spite of fears and expectations to the contrary he never identified himself with any revolutionary movement against either Jewish or Roman authorities. Yet it is surely true that any general putting into practice of the principles of the Sermon on the Mount would have had to be accompanied by a radical transformation or complete overthrow of the social structure of Jesus' time, as also of our own time.

On the whole it does not appear that there was any great difference between Jesus and Paul with respect to their attitude toward institutions and customs inherited from the past. Both were temperamentally conservative, yet both were too closely in touch with real life, were too clear-thinking, had too intuitive a sense of values, to be reactionary on current issues—to hold stubbornly to the past when it stood in the way of present progress. Thus we find that in spite of innate conservatism their attitude on concrete issues repeatedly reveals itself as what we to-day would call progressive, liberal. This stands out clearly, for example, in Jesus' disputes with the more rigid Pharisees and in Paul's contest with the Judaizers in the Galatian churches. In both cases the issue was between the new and the old, between freedom

to develop in conformity with new light and conservative adherence to the status quo, and it was the progressive position which Jesus and Paul defended.

Again, it is often said that the religion of Jesus was simple—a thing of the inner life and of daily conduct and attitude; while through the influence of Paul Christianity has come down to us in a form highly complex, highly intellectualized—a thing of elaborate beliefs, dogmas, and creeds. There is a measure of truth in this, but it is easy to make too much of it. The religion which the great creeds present has an aspect which is markedly different from the religion of Jesus as revealed by a careful study of the Gospel materials. As to this there is little room for doubt. But it does not necessarily follow that Paul was wholly or even mainly responsible for the change. On the contrary it is extremely likely that such a development would have taken place if Paul had never lived. Christianity's Jewish heritage on the one hand, and its early Græco-Roman environment on the other hand, would be sufficient to account for it. In particular the strong Greek influence brought to bear on it in the early centuries is to be held largely responsible for the intellectualizing tendency: the tendency of the new religion to resolve itself into a speculative cosmic philosophy.

Paul himself was clearly under this influence, though it was counterbalanced by his Hebrew feeling for the concrete and practical and by his strong sense of religion as an inner, spiritual experience. The importance of the role which he played in the later development is neither to be denied nor to be unduly magnified. If the dogmatic theology which has come down to us is to be traced to Paul, it is at any rate clear that the *whole* of his outlook has not been embodied therein. It may even be maintained that his one supreme and permanent contribution to Christian doctrine—namely, the insistence that the new religion was not a mechanical scheme but that its

essence lay in an inner union of the believer with God in Christ—is precisely the point which dogmatic theology has most conspicuously missed.

In Jesus, on the other hand, we note but little of the speculative strain. He was intellectual, but his was a different—we may say deeper—type of intellectuality. His tendency to probe—to strip off externals and get at the heart of things—reveals an outlook that is what we might call "scientific" to-day. That his followers have not always emulated him in this respect may well be deemed a matter for regret, but it need not be a matter for surprise. The religion which took its start with Jesus could develop only as its medium of expression—which is to say the thought and outlook of Europe in the past nineteen centuries—made possible.

But the more one studies the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles the more clearly one sees that fundamentally Jesus and Paul had the same outlook on religion and the relation of religion to life. In what is most essential they speak with one voice.

We find them in agreement as to what religion *is not*. Both revolted strongly against the overemphasis of externals. The point, as seen by both, was not that religion should have no external forms or observances, but that these must not be allowed to usurp the central place. Jesus rebukes those Pharisees who "tithe mint and rue and every herb, and pass over justice and the love of God." He declares that "these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone" (Luke 11:42). Paul, on the question of whether the Jewish rite of circumcision must be observed by Christians, takes the position that "neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love" (Gal.5:6).

We find them in agreement also as to what religion most essentially *is*. Paul's "faith working through love" embodies the same answer as Jesus' love of God and love

of fellow man (Mark 12:28-34). "Faith," with Paul, is something mystical rather than intellectual. It indicates the outreach of the soul toward God, the union of man's life with His. And to "love" God, in Jesus' thought, must have meant essentially the same. Perhaps Paul's thought moved more in the direction of the Hellenistic idea of *absorption* in the divine, while with Jesus the Jewish conception of God as transcendent retained its force more fully. But the difference would not be vital. And Paul's insistence that faith must "work," through love exhibited toward fellow men, is entirely parallel with Jesus' declaration that the second great requirement, after love of God, is neighbor-love. The ethical sense was very strong in both: religion which was real would necessarily be active, serving as a motive force for the whole of life.

It is worth noting, further, that Paul was true to his Master's spirit when he associated *hope* with faith and love as the three great Christian endowments. In spite of discouragements, in the face of apparent disaster, both maintained optimism, confidence. The unseen did not lose its reality through long remaining unseen. The present might be dark, but light would dawn, for a loving God was in control. *Optimism* must be set down, with mysticism and good will, as fundamental elements in the religious outlook of Jesus and of Paul.

B. New Testament Religion after Paul

The Christian generations immediately following Paul honored him but did not understand him well. In a remarkably short time a collection of his letters came to have the rank of "scripture," but readers were wont to misinterpret them, as one writer warns, "unto their own destruction" (2 Peter 3:16). An educated Gentile Christian who had written a book about Jesus composed a second volume in which Paul was the main hero, but

there is surprisingly little of the "Paulinism" of the epistles in this Book of Acts. The author apparently had been a traveling companion of Paul's, but he scarcely seems to have shared his deeper thoughts. And what has been said of Paul may be said of Jesus as well. There was an increasing interest in his life and teachings, as the composition of the Gospels is enough to show, but it is clear that the Christians who thus busied themselves in gathering reminiscences of their Founder had great difficulty in seeing him as he really had been. Mark's understanding of the reason for Jesus' custom of telling stories is a striking illustration of this point (Mark 4:10-12).

That some of Paul's speculations should have been found hard to understand is not surprising. The same may perhaps be said of the utopianism of Jesus. But the trouble went deeper than that. If the later New Testament writings are at all representative of the outlook of the period (and they probably are), it was above all the *mysticism* of the Founder and the great Apostle which few in the two or three generations that followed were able to apprehend. Paul had won his battle for the religion of the inner life as far as circumcision was concerned, but that is far from saying that he had won it for all cases and all time. The tendency to think of external mechanisms of one sort or another as essential to religion is too deeply rooted in human nature to have been so easily exorcised. It shows itself repreatedly in the later books of the New Testament, whether in the emphasis on orthodoxy, in the development of Christian sacraments, or in other ways. We have seen that even the Fourth Gospel, which has a real mysticism of its own, is not free from it (cf., for example, its emphasis on intellectual *belief*).

Over against the weakening of the mystical is to be noted a strengthening of the *practical* emphasis. For

the everyday needs of converts, and those whom the Christian missionaries hoped to make converts, it seemed necessary to state the tenets of the new religion in more specific and concrete terms than heretofore. It is true that there was much that was concrete and specific in what had been preserved of the teachings of Jesus, as also in the letters of Paul, but this was not sufficient for the needs of new communities in different environments.

For one thing neither of these two bodies of teachings sufficed to clear up the inherent difficulty in holding to the reality of the Founder's past life on earth while experiencing present fellowship with him as a divine being. That is to say that the need was felt for a more clear-cut Christology, and to this task "John" in particular addressed himself. And there was a similar need in the matter of soteriology. As long as the old Jewish outlook held sway, and Christians lived in expectation of the speedy return of their Lord with a kingdom prepared on high, there was at hand a conception of salvation—of what Christ would do for his followers—that was sufficiently vivid and clear cut. But with the decline of this expectation there was need of something to take its place. It should be something more tanglible, if possible, than the mysticism of Jesus and of Paul, in which the great benefit accruing from fellowship with God was simply the fellowship itself: all else flowed naturally from that. And here again the author of John and 1 John attempted to supply the need: to analyze the mystical passion, so to speak, and connect it more adequately not only with the historical Jesus but with the life of Christians and the upbuilding of the church in the author's time and neighborhood.

Thus Christian doctrines were emerging and becoming crystallized: Christ's preëxistence and membership in the divine Trinity, his presence at the right hand of God and mediatorial activity, the sacramental signifi-

cance and efficacy of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, etc. Their formulation was due to practical difficulties and needs, and having been formulated and having won the acceptance of the majority they naturally came to be used as standards in the settling of other difficulties and the preservation of uniformity.

Emphasis on ethics continues strong in this period, but we have seen that it is a different sort of emphasis from that of Jesus and Paul. What we sense, once more, is the gain of the practical at the expense of the mystical, or, in other words, of the concrete at the expense of the vital. A passage from Hebrews may be cited as fairly typical: "Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter the holy place by the blood of Jesus . . . and having a great priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in fulness of faith . . . let us hold fast the confession of our hope that it waver not . . . and let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works" (10:19ff). Or this from 1 John: "And who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ . . . " (5:5-6). The emphasis on intellectual belief, and the allusion to the sacraments, show the trend of the writer's thought. The same writer elsewhere insists that "Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because his seed abideth in him and he cannot sin" (3:9; 5:18). This gives a conception of the relation between religion and conduct that is little short of magical.

The later New Testament writers, then, as compared with Jesus and Paul, reveal a shifting of emphasis from the mystical and vital to the concrete and practical. It remains that we make the comparison with respect to the third characteristic of the religious outlook of the Founder and the Apostle to the Gentiles: *optimism, confidence.*

During the half-century following the death of Paul the Christian movement underwent experiences which might well have resulted in loss of confidence. Jesus did not return, as had been expected. The vivid sense of the Spirit's presence was no longer felt. There was internal strife, and there was persecution at the hands of local and imperial authorities. And there is evidence that the morale of some Christian communities was affected by these experiences. Such documents as Hebrews, Revelation, 2 John, Jude, and the Pastoral Epistles all reveal situations which clearly seemed to the writers to be critical. From their tone we would gather that the rank and file of Christians of the time did not possess either such understanding of the nature of their religion or such appreciation of its greatness as to inspire them with aggressive confidence.

But whatever may be said of the religion of the Christian masses, of the New Testament writers of the period it must be said that they need not fear comparison with their predecessors in the matter of optimism, steadfast assurance in facing the future. The author of Revelation was in exile when he wrote, banished for his religion's sake; and he was writing to communities which were by no means perfect examples of Christian steadfastness. But that his own spirit was unconquered and unconquerable is witnessed in every paragraph. The author of Hebrews, writing to Christians in danger of backsliding, defines faith as "assurance of things hoped for, a conviction of things not seen" (11:1), and records in burning language his certainty that Christ's followers are heirs to a kingdom that is eternal, unshakable (12:18-29). The author of Jude paints a dark picture of conditions in the church to which he writes, but of the all-sufficiency of Christianity itself he has no doubt. The religion of which he is the protagonist has been *once for all* delivered to the saints (verse 3). We have seen that the

author of the Fourth Gospel places particular stress on the definiteness, the finality, of Christianity, and is emphatic in his assertions about it: "We speak that which we know, and bear witness of that which we have heard" (3:11; cf. above, p. 92). It is not without significance that of the twenty-six occurrences of the world "boldness" (παρρησία) thirteen are in John and 1 John, while most of the others also are in the later writings. In spite of hard times the note with which the New Testament closes is not a note of discouragement or disillusionment. Indeed that outlook cannot be said to be characteristic of any single writing in the New Testament. In this collection there is no Ecclesiastes. It is not surprising that increasing numbers from the Greek world—now passing through its period of "failure of nerve"—should have turned to the religion which these books present.

C. The Religion of the New Testament and the World of To-day

We may begin with a word on the relation of the religion of the New Testament to our present interest in *social* progress. If the world in which we live is bad there are two things, broadly speaking, which may be making it bad: people and institutions. The two cannot be separated rigidly, yet when men face the problem of how their world is to be made better they usually focus attention on one or other of the two. The Founder and early propagators of Christianity had mainly people in view; the modern social reformer looks mainly to the transforming of institutions. Here is the outstanding difference between the point of view of the New Testament and the prevailing point of view of to-day on the problem of human betterment, and it is a difference which yields food for thought. We may well ponder the question of whether the shift of emphasis has been justified, and if so on what grounds.

One can readily think of grounds on which it may, in a measure at least, be justified. In New Testament times, and indeed for long afterward, men scarcely dreamed of the possibility of a radical change in the existing order from within. The task was too stupendous, and the masses were far too little prepared for undertaking it. It must be done if at all from outside, or rather from overhead. The pagan hoped that Augustus, wielding the power of a god or demigod, might usher in the Golden Age. The Jew looked for the direct intervention of Jehovah, in person or through His messianic representative. The Christian took over the hope, mainly in its Jewish form. But after nineteen centuries there has been a marked change of outlook. Men now dare to believe that institutions can be transformed from within, by themselves; that the agents whom God will use for this mighty task will be men, not angels or demigods; that men must therefore gird themselves for a greater enterprise than was formerly realized: the enterprise not merely of preparing thmselves as individuals for worthy citizenship in a better "Kingdom," but also of preparing a Kingdom that will be worthy of the better citizenship.

Both parts of the task would seem to be absolutely essential, and they are mutually supplementary. If church leaders of to-day are neglecting the latter part they would do well to ponder the possibilities for good (as well as for evil) latent in the new consciousness of power which the masses of men have come to possess; if social reformers are neglecting the former part they will do well to turn back to the New Testament. No doubt the early Christian leaders who speak from its pages were "one-sided," as the great leaders of human thought and progress have always been, but one may affirm that they put the emphasis on that which was and is most vital.

To pass to another point. The world of yesterday

found the religion of the *later* New Testament writings fairly congenial and acceptable. This is not to say that it felt great need of such a religion, as many in the first century Greek world did, or indeed of any religion. It merely felt that such a religion was not obnoxious, and was useful to a degree. The emphasis on the practical was in conformity with the spirit of the earlier "scientific" age, while the note of confidence was in harmony with the mood of a generation which felt that it was now in a position speedily to explore and conquer the universe.

Toward the *earlier* New Testament religion—the religion of Jesus and of Paul—the attitude of the world of yesterday was similar to that of the late first century. It honored it more than it understood it or really entered into its spirit. The teachings of Jesus were exalted on high, but the idea of putting them into practice was not taken seriously. Paul's eager and more or less haphazard attempts to give intellectual expression to his mystical religious experience had long since been transformed into creedal formulas, and since assent to these formulas was deemed the important thing one was likely either to accept or reject them without ever facing the question of whether the experience back of the formulas meant anything to him. The "practical" matter in the Gospels and the Pauline letters was used, to be sure—sayings of Jesus which could be detached, without too much difficulty, from his utopian ideals, the common-sense advice which is abundant in Paul's letters and which may be separated, if one wishes, from the spiritual religion on which Paul himself always based it—but such use did not involve any real entering into the spirit of Jesus' and Paul's religion.

Is the world of to-day in a position to understand better, and in a mood to appreciate more fully and appropriate more deeply, the earlier New Testament religion? Perhaps. Certainly the world of to-day—the post-war world

we may call it—is in some respects different from the world of yesterday. There is room for the surmise that we are entering upon a "failure of nerve" era of our own. At any rate we have discovered that the boundaries of the universe have a disconcerting habit of receding before our advance, so that the area of the unknown becomes greater rather than less, and the more we become partakers of the scientific outlook the more we see that it has a mysticism of its own—that it is far from being exclusively practical. This tends, if not to loss of confidence, at least to a gain in modesty. And the war, which seemed to show that we were rather more likely to destroy than to save ourselves with the new power which we had acquired, did something toward accelerating the tendency.

Religion, as represented by Jesus and Paul, insists that man's most effective way of establishing contact with his universe is the mystical way. It does not depreciate mind, but it holds that man possesses another faculty, the spirit, which is mightier, has a broader range, sounds greater depths. A general acceptance of this view on the basis of mere credulity is neither to be expected nor desired, but an increasing acceptance of it on the basis of accumulated and tested experience is another matter, and it may be that this is what lies ahead of us. The present age is already an age of faith in a deeper and truer sense than any preceding age.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING

PART I (CHAPTERS I-III)

On the history of the interpretation of the Bible see F. W. Farrar, *The History of Interpretation;* G. H. Gilbert, *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible;* Eduard Reuss, *History of the New Testament,* Vol. II, Book V. On textual criticism see M. R. Vincent, *A History of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament;* F. G. Kenyon, *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament;* K. Lake, *The Text of the New Testament;* Philip Schaff, *A Companion to the Greek Testament and the English Versions,* Chapters II-VI; A. T. Robertson, *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament.* On the higher criticism see H. S. Nash, *The History of the Higher Criticism;* A. C. Zenos, *The Elements of the Higher Criticism;* C. A. Briggs, *A General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture.* On the subject of the historical and practical points of view (pages 28-30 above) compare my article, "Is Bible Study Identical with Religious Education?" in *The Journal of Religion,* September, 1923. For books on New Testament Introduction that are in the main or wholly non-technical see H. T. Fowler, *The History and Literature of the New Testament;* J. H. Snowden, *The Making and Meaning of the New Testament;* E. J. Goodspeed, *The Story of the New Testament.* For those wishing to begin the study of the Greek New Testament, J. G. Machen, *New Testament Greek for Beginners,* is recommended. See also J. Morgan Jones, *The New Testament in Modern Education.*

PART II (CHAPTERS IV-X)

For fuller and more technical discussions of matters treated in Chapters IV-VI see James Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament;* A. Jülicher, *An Introduc-*

tion to the New Testament; A. S. Peake, *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament.* On the Gospels see especially B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels,* and James Moffatt, *The Theology of the Gospels,* also a *Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels,* edited by E. D. Burton and E. J. Goodspeed, which may be had in either Greek or English. See also the one-volume *Commentary on the Bible* edited by A. S. Peake (cf. above, page 34), and articles in the standard encyclopedias and Bible dictionaries. On the subject of the New Testament canon see E. C. Moore, *The New Testament in the Christian Church;* A. Harnack, *The Origin of the New Testament;* A. Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament.* The ancient versions are discussed in the works on textual criticism listed above. On the general history of the English Bible see B. F. Westcott, *History of the English Bible;* John Eadie, *The English Bible,* 2 vols.; W. F. Moulton, *History of the English Bible;* Ira M. Price, *The Ancestry of Our English Bible;* E. J. Goodspeed, *The Making of the English New Testament.* On the Revised Version see further Schaff, *op. cit.,* pages 371-494; George Milligan, *The Expository Value of the Revised Version;* M. B. Riddle, *The Story of the Revised New Testament, American Standard Edition.* On mistakes of the revisers in matters of grammar (page 145 above) cf. my articles, "The Greek Aorist," in *The Expositor,* May and June, 1915, and "The Greek Article in 1st and 2nd Century Papyri," in *The American Journal of Philology,* 1916, pages 333ff.

PART III (Chapters XI-XV)

For works of writers contemporary with the New Testament period see especially Josephus, *Works,* Whiston's translation revised by A. R. Shilleto, 5 vols.; Philo Judaeus, *Works,* translated by C. D. Yonge, 4 vols.; Seneca, *Epistulae Morales,* translated by R. M. Gummere in Loeb Classical Library series, 3 vols. For a comparison of Seneca's outlook with that of the New Testament see J. B. Lightfoot, *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age,* pages 249-316 (cf. above, pages 242-244). For general discussions of the New Testament background see S. J. Case, *The Evolution of Early Christianity;* S. Angus, *The Environment of Early Christianity.* For

works on the Jewish background see G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era,* 2 vols.; E. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ,* 5 vols.; S. Mathews, *History of New Testament Times in Palestine;* F. C. Porter, *Messages of the Apocalyptic Writers.* For works on the Hellenistic environment see L. Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire,* 4 vols.; S. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius;* G. Murray, *Five Stages of Greek Religion* (new and revised edition of the *Four Stages of Greek Religion* quoted above, pages 252-264); E. Zeller, *Stoics, Epicureans* and *Sceptics;* G. Murray, *The Stoic Philosophy;* F. Legge, *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity;* F. Cumont, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism.*

PART IV (Chapters XVI-XXIV)

On the matters discussed in Chapters XVI-XVII above, see especially the "Prolegomena" to J. Moffatt's *Introduction* (listed above), pages 1-58. See also A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East;* G. Milligan, *The New Testament Documents.* On New Testament history in general see G. W. Wade, *New Testament History;* E. F. Scott, *The First Age of Christianity.* The last named is non-technical. On the life of Jesus see O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus;* C. F. Kent, *Life and Teachings of Jesus;* T. R. Glover, *The Jesus of History;* G. Berguer, *Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus from the Psychological and Psycho-Analytic Point of View.* See also A. Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus;* H. Weinel and A. G. Widgery, *Jesus in the Nineteenth Century and After.* On the life of Paul see B. W. Robinson, *The Life of Paul;* F. G. Peabody, *The Apostle Paul and the Modern World.*[1]

[1] For an admirable annotated bibliography of the New Testament see C. W. Votaw, *Books for New Testament Study,* 64 pages, University of Chicago Press, 1911. A more recent *List of Books on the New Testament* is published in the *Union Theological Seminary Bulletin,* January, 1922, having been prepared for the use of students by Professors Frame, Scott, and Tyron. It has eighteen pages and is classified but not annotated. A much more brief list may be seen in *The Churchman,* March 28, 1925. All these lists give data as to publishers and dates.

INDEX

(The black face type indicates the more important page references; italics indicate the more important page references.)

Academy, the, 240f.
Acts, Book of **69-74**, 381-442, 470f., and *passim*
Africa, North, 105, 111
Alexander the Great, 110, 169f., 187, 228, 261, *267*
Alexandria, 215, 241, 295, 393
Alexandrinus, Codex, 105
American Standard New Testament, The, **141-147**
Am-ha-aretz. *See* People of the Land
Ananus, 386
Anonymity, **299**f.
Anthony, Saint, 303
Antichrist, 28
Antioch, 46, 386, 393f., 407f., 409-411, 421-424, 443
Antioch (in Pisidia), 46, 250, 410, 419, 452
Antiochus IV (Epiphanes), 170, 188, 299, 316
Apocalyptic, 78f., 295, *297*, **315-322**, 346f., 373, 380f., 412f.
Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, 197, 200
Apollonius of Tyana, 303
Apollos, 429
Apostles, the, 64, 102, 107f., 361ff., 376, 389-393, 405, 407
Aquila, 427
Arabia, 352, 406, 447
Aratus, 286
Aristocrats, **233**f.
Aristotle, 15, 235, 240, 258, 267f., 304
Assassins, the, 193
Assyria, 111
Astrology, **261**f.
Athanasius, 106, 303
Athens, 241, 258, 273, 286, 300, 411
Atonement, Day of, **210**f.
Augustine, 5-7, 106, 274f.
Augustus, 173, 230, 247, 261, 266, 267f.
Authorized Version. *See* King James Version

Badé, W. F., 34
Ballantine's Translation, 151-165
Barcochba, 444
Barnabas, 22, 105, 408, 422f., 424, 428, 452
Barnabas, Epistle of, 101, 105, 282, 441
Bede, 112, 116
Bengel, 18
Bentley, 18
Berguer, G., 305, 339f., 366f., 377f.
Bethlehem, 173, 332f., 335
Bible reading, **26-28**, 36, 103, 112
Bible study. *Chaps. II-III*
Biography, **303-305**
Bishops, 457
Bishops' Bible, the, **124**, 130-132
Business in the Græco-Roman World, 186, **230**f.

Cæsarea, 91, 176, 233, 386f., 392, 411, 434f., 444
Cæsarea Philippi, 175, 361, 365, 367
Caius of Rome, 393
Calvin, 6-8
Canon, New Testament. *Chap. VII*
Canon, Old Testament, 199f.
Capernaum, 354, 357, 360-362, 368
Carthage, 111
Chapter and verse divisions, **144**f., **152**f.
Charles, R. H., 191, 193
Chasidim, 188
Christology, 76f., **89-95**, 307-309, 379-382, **459-464**, 472
Cicero, 97, 273, 324
Cilicia, 407, 410
Circumcision, 46f., 170, 422-425, 452, 469
Claudius, 175f., 233
Cleanthes, 237, 286

Clement of Alexandria, 4, 17, 22, 105
Clement of Rome, 22, 105, 107, 282, 393
Clement, First Epistle of, 229, 438f., 441, 446f.
Clement, Second Epistle of, 101
Coleridge, S. T., 95
Colossæ, 52f.
Colossians, Epistle to, **52f.**, 88, 96, 291, 296, 314, 395
Compilation, **289-292**
Constantine, 12, 184
Corinth, 44-50, 411f., 418, 427f., 443, 447, 455f.
Corinthians, First Epistle to, **47f.**, 50, 59f., 96, 200, 296, 313, 392, 395, 427-429, 455, 457, 467
Corinthians Second Epistle to, **48-50**, 96, 296, 395, 427
Cornelius, 387, 392
Coverdale, **120f.**, 132
Creation, 226f.
Crete, 447
Crispus, 418
Criticism, Biblical, **15-25**, 154-156

Dalmatia, 447
Damascus, 376, 398, 403-406, 409
Daniel, Book of, 295-299, 315-321
Deacons, 457
Deissmann, A., 313
Demetrius, 84
Derbe, 46, 410, 427
Destiny, 261
Deuteronomy, Book of, 67
Diatessaron, The, 99
Didache, The, 86, 106, 441
Diogenes, 240
Diotrephes, 84
Disciples. *See* Apostles
Dispersion, Jewish, **246-251**, 386, 397
Docetists, 84, 89, 364
Domitian, 75, 78, 79, 184, 268, 316, 391, 432, 449
Doutté, E., 253

Ebionites, 444
Ecclesiasticus. *See* Sirach
Eddy, Mary Baker, 10
Egypt, 110f., 170, 229, 247, 332f., 448
Elders (Presbyters), 457
Emperor-worship, **265-268**, 320
Enoch, First Book of, 154, 284, 316, 318
Enoch, Second Book of, 224, 316
Epaphras, 53
Epaphroditus, 55
Ephesians, Epistle to, **53-54**, 88, 96, 291, 296, 314, 395
Ephesus, 22, 46f., 49, 52-54, 94, 293, 391f., 411f., 427, 431, 433, 443, 446
Epictetus, 237, 244, 273
Epicureans, **235-237**, 260
Epicurus, 235-237, 260, 311f., 313
Epiphanius, 443
Epistles, **310-315**
Erasmus, 119
Eschatology, 77f., **223-225**, 315-322, 414, **416f.**, 453-455, 462-463
Essenes, **190f.**, 193
Ethics (Morality), 76f., 85, 89, 244f., **273-276**, 316, 414-416, 459, 473
Eusebius, 295, 439, 443f.
Exile, the, 188, 191, 215, 346
Ezra, 188, 195, 213
Ezra, Fourth, 223f.

"Failure of Nerve," **258-262**, 478
Faith, 86, 413f., 469f.
Felix, 179f., 398, 431, 437
Festivals, Jewish, **208-211**
Festus, 179f., 431, 437
Florus, 181
Fortune, 261
Freedmen, **232f.**, 234, 456
Friedländer, L., 265f.
Fundamentals in Bible study, **30f.**, 36

Gaius, 84
Galatia, 44, 46, 410f., 413
Galatians, Epistle to, 42, **46f.**, 50f., 86f., 96, 296, 386f., 395, 405-407, 409, 413, 422, 423, 425, 427, 452
Galilee, 63, 93, 174f., 181f., 186, 213, 219, 246, **344f.**, 354-368, 371, 374f.
Galilee, Sea of, 63, 174, 186, 354
Gallio, 177, 179, 431
Gamaliel, 189, 293, 397, 401
Gaul, 105, 111

Genevan Bible, the, **122-124**, 129-131
Gentiles, 54, 68, 70f., 247-251, 382, 386f., 388, 394, 397, 408f. 419-421, 423-426, 451f.
Genius doctrine, **265**f.
Geographical expansion of Christianity, **443-448**
Gischala, 397
Glover, T. R., 345
Gnostics and Gnosticism, 87, 89, 93, 102, 259-262, **272**f., 461f.
"God-fearers," **249**f.
Golden Rule, 309
Goodspeed's Translation, 50, 151-165, 342, 357, 428, 432, 434f., 437
Gospels, the, 4, 28, *Chap. V*, **90-95**, **97-99**, **100**f., 288, 290f., 294f., **302-310**, Chaps. XVIII-XIX, 374-376, 441f.
Great Bible, the, **121**f., 123f.
Greek language, **110**f., 113f., 187
Greek religion. *Chap. XV*
Griesbach, 18
Grouping of New Testament writings, **42**f.
Guthe, H., 248

Hadrian, 183, 444
Hampton Court Conference, 129
Harnack, A., 323
Harris, Rendel, 154
Hebrews, Epistle to, 22, **75-80**, 92, 104f., 202, 281f., 314, 445f., 453, 460f., 473f.
Hebrews, Gospel according to, 106, 331
Hegesippus, 386
Hellenism, 187f., **228-230**, **246-251**, 344f.
Hermas, Shepherd of, 105, 107, 315
Herodotus, 254
Herods, the, **171-176**, 191, 204f., 208, 332, 349, 354, 362, 391, 437
Hesiod, 254
Higher Criticism. *See* Criticism, Biblical
Holtzmann, O., 331, 349, 368
Homer, 254, 302, 316
Hope, 223, 470
Hort, 18, 136

Iconium, 46, 410
Ignatius, 97, 393, 446, 457
Interpolation, **287**f.
Irenæus, 17, 22, 61, 99, 105, 391
Isaiah, 281, 451
Italy, 105

Jackson, F. J. Foakes, 218, 247
James, brother of Jesus, 85f., 343, **385**f., 423f., 434, 445
James, son of Zebedee, 22, 391
James, Epistle of, **85**f., 89, 104, 107, 296, 314, 323, 445, 456, 459
Jamnia, 184
Jericho, 173
Jerome, 106, 112, 114, 244, 259, 397
Jerusalem, 46, 50, 62, 69, 71f., 172, 176, 183f., 187f., 200, 202, 204-215, 291, 310, 340, 368-394, 398f., 408f., 419, 421-426, 434-436, 443, 450f., 462
Jesus Christ
  Davidic descent, **334**f.
  death, 91, 366-368, **370-373**
  earthly life, 29, *Chaps. XVIII-XIX*, 379-382, 399, 459-462, 465-470
  greatness, 53-55, 65, 76f., 92, 93f., 358f., 413, 459-461
  Messiahship, 63, 68, 86, 90, 352f., 365f., 369f., 379-383, 389, 420, 451
  miracles, 90, 93, 357f.
  paternity, **335-340**
  preëxistence, 55, 90, 339, 460, 472
  resurrection, 86, **373-383**
  return, 45f., **58**f., 75, 77, 88, 93, 416f., 454f., 462
  teachings, 65, 66f., 69, 93, 308f., 345f., 354-373, 450f., 467, 469-472
  union with, 86, 91, 459
Jewish War, **180-183**
Jews, 68, 70, 100, *Chaps. XI-XIII*, **246-251**, **418-421**, **449-452**
John, the Apostle, 22, 79, 94, 296f., **390-392**, 423
John, the Baptist, 4, 63, 193, 300, 348-360
John, the Elder (Presbyter), 83f., 392
John, Gospel of, **89-95**, **285***f.*, 294f., 296f., 307f., 354f., 446, 461-464, and *passim*

John, First Epistle of, 84, **89**f., 94, 104, 107, 314, 446, 461f., 473, 475
John, Second Epistle of, **83**f., 107, 314, 446, 474
John, Third Epistle of, **83**f., 107, 314, 446
Joppa, 392
Joseph, brother of Jesus, 343
Joseph, reputed father of Jesus, 332-337, 340-343
Josephus, 175f., **181-183**, 191, 193, 197, 208, 215, 247, 249, 284, 327, 330, 344, 349, 386, 393
Jubilees, Book of, 197
Judæa, 93, **173**f., 177f., 343f., 354
Judaism, 68, 184, 187f., 214, **219-227**, 248-251, 276, 371f., 386f., 452-455
Judaizers, 87, 424f.
Jude (Judas), brother of Jesus, 88, 343
Jude, Epistle of, **86-88**, 89, 104, 291, 459, 474
Julius Cæsar, 172, 247, 267f.
Jülicher, A., Pref., 305f., 310
Justin, 17, 61, 107
Juvenal, 233, 274

Kent, C. F., 331
King James Version, 18f., 115, 124, *Chap. IX*, 150, 154, 161-164
Kingdom of God (Heaven), 64, 93, 223-225, **359**f., 363, **373**, 476

Lachmann, 18
Lake, K., 218, 246f.
Laodicea, 54, 97
Law, the (Jewish), 51, 67, 85, 171, 187, 194-203, 210, 213, 217f., 221f., 227, 390, 402, 419-424, 434f.
Levites, 207f.
Life, 463
Lincoln, 13
Literal translation, 126, 145f.
Locke, John, 152f.
Logia, 66f., 308
Logos, 237, 239, 244, 285, 308
Lord's Prayer, 288
Lord's Supper, 47, 423, 473
Love, 48, 91f., 426, 430f., 469f.
Lowell, 30
Luke, 22, 27, 31, 60, 69, 73, 286, 427
Luke, Gospel of, **69-73**, 103, 290f., 333, 340-342, 348, and *passim*
Luther, 3, 12, 119, 125
Lyceum, the, 240f.
Lydda, 392
Lydia, 427
Lystra, 46, 410, 427

Maccabees, Books of, 306
Maccabees, the, **170**f., 188, 190f., 204, 208, 211, 215
Macedonia, 49f., 71, 96, 410f., 427, 447
Mana, 253
Manuscripts of New Testament, 15-20, 113-115, 136, 143
Marcion, 103f.
Marcus Aurelius, 237
Mark, 27, **61**f., 107, 408, 426f.
Mark, Gospel of, **61-65**, 304, 307f., 351f., 450f., 459f., and *passim*
Mary, mother of Jesus, 323, 332-337, 340-343
Materialism, 85, 89
Matthew, the Apostle, 66f., 178
Matthew, Gospel of, **65-68**, 290f., and *passim*
Matthew, Bible, the, 121
Menzies, 294
Messianism, Jewish, 225f., 335, 337, 348f., 379-382
Middle Ages, 112f., 267
Miletus, 433
Mill, John, 17
Millennium, 223f., **320**f.
Misplaced passages, **288**f.
Mithra cult, 259, 262, 271
Moffatt, J., Pref., 34, 283, 286, 289, 292f., 295, 297f., 307, 311, 323f., 326, 336, 403
Moffatt's Translation, 10, 50, 151-165, 281, 289, 404, 420, 439f., 455
Mohammed, 354
Monotheism, 219-222, 256f.
Montefiore, C. G., 192, 194, 214f.
Montgomery's Translation, 151-165
Moore, C. H., 230
Morality. *See* Ethics
Muratorian Fragment, 438
Murray, G., 238-240, 252-264, **273-275**, 304f.

Mystery religions, 262f., **269-273**, 277f., 414
Mysticism, 413-417, 429, 440, 462-464, 469-473, 478

Nathaniel, 337
Nazareth, 217f., 332f., 335, 344, 349, 356, 397
Near East, 110, 187
Nehemiah, 188, 190
Nero, 75f., 182, 320, 439, 449
Nerva, 391
Nicholas of Hereford, 117
Nicodemus, 189

Old Testament, The, 67f., 99f., 102f., 185, **199f.**, 224, 246, **281-284**, 289f., 321f., 324, 345-347, 383, 450, **452f.**
Olympian gods, the, **254-258**
Onesimus, 54f.
Optimism, 470, 473-475
Organization, **456-458**
Origen, 3-6, 17, 22, 105, 444
Palestine, **169-188**, 210f., 215, **443-445**, and *passim*
Papias, 22, 61, 66f., 391
Papyri, 155, 312
Parthians, 320
Pastoral Epistles, the, **80-83**, 86, 296, 314, 395, **438**, 457, 474
Patmos, 77, 391f.
Paul (Saul), *Chaps. IV, XXI, XXII,* **465-470**, and *passim*
Paul, Acts of, 106
Peabody, F. G., 401f.
Peake's Commentary, 34, 192, 194, 214f., 238-240, 294
Pella, 443
Pentecost, 72, **210**, 379, 383f.
People of the Land (Am-ha-aretz), **191-194**
Perea, 174f., 187, 368
Persian religion, 223
Persecution of Christians, **75-80**, 184, 316-322, 448f.
Peter, the Apostle, 62-65, 79, 88f., 294-296, 310, 365, **385**, **392f.**, 406f., 423f., and *passim*
Peter, Apocalypse of, 106, 296, 315
Peter, First Epistle of, **75-80**, 107, 314, 446, 449
Peter, Second Epistle of, 23, **86-89**, 97, 100, 104f., 107, 284, 291, 295, 298f., 314, 454f., 459, 470
Peter, Gospel of, 106, 295f.
Petronius, 233, 274
Pharisees, 64, 68, 171, **188-194**, 200f., 221, 227, 363, 370f., 399-403, 435f., 453, 469
Philemon, Epistle to, **54f.**, 96, 314, 395, 428, 438
Philip, the Apostle, 337
Philip, one of the Seven, 390
Philippi, 55, 97, 410, 443, 447
Philippians, Epistle to, **55f.**, 96, 313, 395, 397, 438f., 447
Philo, 191, 197, 215, 226, 247, **248f.**, 274, **284-286**
Philosophy, **234-245**, 260f.
Philostratus, 303
Phœnicia, 63, 185, 393
Pilate, Pontius, **174**, 179, 330
Plato, 235, 240, 257, 266, 274, 303f.
Plebeians, **233**
Pliny, 323f., 447
Plotinus, 259
Poetry in New Testament, 145, **322-326**
Polycarp, 97, 282
Pompey, 172, 267
Pope, the, 116, 118, 128
Presbyters. *See* Elders
Priests, Jewish, **207-209**, 211-215
Priscilla, 427
Prison Epistles, the, **52-56**, 393, 439f.
Prophets, Hebrew, 67, 75f., 113, 257, 284, 316, 420, 422
Proverbs, Book of, 304, 316
Provinces, Roman, **176-180**
Psalms, Book of, 115, 281
Pseudepigrapha. *See* Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha
Pseudonymity, **295-299**
Ptolemies, the, 170
Publicans, 178
Puritans, 128f.
Purvey, John, 117
Pythagoreans, 298

Reformation, the, 118, 125
Religious education, Pref., 35, 43
Renan, 68
Resurrection, 48, **223-225**, 321
Revelation, Book of, 27f., **75-80**, 94, 101f., 104f., 259, 281, 282,

291, 296, 302, **315-322**, 323, 432, 445f., 448f., 453f., 474
Revised Version, 19f., 115, 126, **134-147**, 149f., 152, 154f., 160-163, 288, 322
Rheims-Doway Bible, the, **124-126**, 131, 142
Rhodes, 241
Rhythmic prose, **323-326**
Roman church, 51f., 80, 392f., 433, 445f.
Roman Empire, 13, 73, 110, 228-234, 320, 398, 433
Roman government, 75, 78, 80, **171-184**, 247, 319f., 431-438
Romans, Epistle to, 17, **50-52**, 53, 56, 96, 229, 281, 296, 313f., 395, 436
Rome (city), 51, 54f., 62, 69, 71, 79, 96f., 103, 111, 116, 171f., 183, 212f., 215, 229, 247, 266-268, 310, 320, 392f., 396, 431, 437-439

Sacraments, 463, 472f.
Sadducees, 171, **190-193**, 196, 201, 208, 224, 435
Sallust, 293
Sallustius, 263f.
Salvation, 462f.
Samaritans, 187, 390
Sanhedrin, 199f., 208, 370, 386, 404, 435
Schaff, Philip, 138
Schürer, E., 195, 197f., 208f.
Scientific method, 14f., 23-25
Scott, E. F., Pref., 462
Scribes, 68, **194-204**, 453
Seely, J. R., 358
Seleucids, the, 170
Seneca, 97, 237, **241-244**, 296, 311, 324, 431
Septuagint, 217, 229, 282
Sergius Paulus, 431, 456
Sermon on the Mount, 67f., 243, 359
"Servant" passages, 356, 366
Seven, the, **388-390**
Shema, 217
Sidon, 5
Silas, 426f.
Simon, brother of Jesus, 343
Simon, R. (French Biblical critic), 17
Sinaiticus, Codex, 105
Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), 284, 304
Slaves and Slavery, **231**f., 234, 456, 467
Smith, W. R., 253
Smyrna, 97
Social problems, 415f., 466f., 475f.
Socrates, 303, 311
Soden, H. von, 18, 154
Spain, 51, 438f., 447
Speeches, **292-295**
Spirit, the, 41, 64, 93, 101f., 383, 434, 458f., 462
Spiritual "gifts," 47, 60, 430, 458
Spiritism, Jewish, 226
Stephen, 293f., 386, **388-390**, 398, 403, 421
Stoicism, **236-245**, 260-262, 285f., 397, 407, 413, 456
Swete, H. B., 281
Synagogue, 103, 198f., **215-219**, 249f.
Syria, 71, 110, 170, 172,, 177, 185, 407, 410

Tabu, 253
Tacitus, 180, 293, 303f., 330
Talmud, 196, 216
Tarsus, 241, 394, 396-398, 408
Tatian, 99, 111
Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. *See* Didache
Temple, the Jewish, 187, **204-215**, 390
Tertius, 427
Tertullian, 22, 105, 111, 274, 393
Text criticism. *See* Criticism, Biblical
Theophilus, 60, 69, 456
Thessalonians, First Epistle to, 42, **44-46**, 59, 96, 151
Thessalonians, Second Epistle to, 42, **44-46**, 59, 96, 151, 296, 298
Thessalonica, 45, 410, 419, 427, 456
Thucydides, 293
Tiberius, 330
Timothy, 81, 83, 250, 426f.
Timothy, First Epistle to, **80-83**
Timothy, Second Epistle to, **80-83**
Tischendorf, 18, 136
Titus, 49, 81, 83, 427
Titus (Emperor), 183
Titus, Epistle to, **80-83**
Tradition, 196-198, 202, 284, 399

Trajan, 75, 183, 391
Translations. *See* Versions
Travel in the Græco-Roman world, **230**f.
Tregelles, 18
Troas, 49, 81, 410f.
Twentieth-Century New Testament, 151f.
Tychicus, 53f., 427
Tyndale, **118-121**, 123, 127, 132, 134f., 143
Tyre, 5

Ulfilas, 111
Universities, 241

Versions, N. T. (Translations), Pref., 16f., *Chaps. VIII-X*
Vespasian, 182f.
Votaw, C. W., Pref., Ap.
Vulgate, 112, 114, 117, 142f.

Wade, G. W., 246, 392
Wesley, John, 3, 12
Westcott and Hort, 18f., 154, 281
Wettstein, 18
Weymouth's Translation, 151f.
Wisdom of Solomon, 284
World view, Jewish, 226f.
Wyclif, 12, **115-118**, 125, 127, 142f.

Xenophon, 303f.

Zacchæus, 178
Zadokites, **191**, **193**f.
Zealots, **190**, **193**
Zeller, E., 298

This book may be kept
FOURTEEN DAYS
A fine will be charged for each
day the book is kept overtime.

DEC 09 '91			

Demco 38-293

CINCINNATI BIBLE COLLEGE & SEM. LIBRARY
225.061 E11g main
Eakin, Frank/Getting acquainted with the
3 4320 00001 0647

225.061
E11g 25069

Eakin, Frank
Getting Acquainted With the
New Testament

THE CINCINNATI BIBLE
SEMINARY LIBRARY
A. No. 25069
D. D. No. 225.061
E11g